



DELHI UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY

THE CONTENTION AND SHAKESPEARE'S 2 HENRY VI

*Published on the Foundation Established in Memory of
Amasa Stone Mather of the Class of 1907 Yale College*

THE CONTENTION AND
SHAKESPEARE'S 2 HENRY VI

A Comparative Study by Charles Tyler Prouty



NEW HAVEN: YALE UNIVERSITY PRESS, 1 9 5 4

London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, Oxford University Press

Copyright, 1954, by Yale University Press.
Printed in the United States of America by
Vail-Ballou Press, Inc., Binghamton, N.Y.
All rights reserved. This book may not be
reproduced, in whole or in part, in any form
(except by reviewers for the public press),
without written permission from the publishers.
Library of Congress catalog card number: 54-5088

THE AMASA STONE MATHER MEMORIAL PUBLICATION FUND

The present volume is the 25th work published by the Yale University Press on the Amasa Stone Mather Memorial Publication Fund. This Foundation was established August 25, 1922, by a gift to Yale University from Samuel Mather, Esq., of Cleveland, Ohio, in pursuance of a pledge made in June, 1922, on the fifteenth anniversary of the graduation of his son, Amasa Stone Mather, who was born in Cleveland on August 20, 1884, and was graduated from Yale College in the Class of 1907. Subsequently, after traveling abroad, he returned to Cleveland, where he soon won a recognized position in the business life of the city and where he actively interested himself also in the work of many organizations devoted to the betterment of the community and to the welfare of the nation. His death from pneumonia on February 9, 1920, was undoubtedly hastened by his characteristic unwillingness ever to spare himself, even when ill, in the discharge of his duties or in his efforts to protect and further the interests committed to his care by his associates.

PREFACE

A dominant feature of Shakespearean and Elizabethan studies during the past 50 years has been the accumulation of bibliographical knowledge. The cornerstone of such research has been an almost scientific study of printed books based on the customs of the Elizabethan printing house. Here investigators have dealt with physically observable facts, as in the case of Sir Walter Greg's noticing the seeming apostrophe produced by an improperly adjusted space lead in Q_1 of *The Elder Brother*. That the compositor of Q_2 set an apostrophe at this point proves that the copy for Q_2 was a printed copy of Q_1 and not a manuscript.

When we come to another bibliographical problem, the relationship of two texts exhibiting similarities and variants while being of different lengths, the factual evidence is of a somewhat different nature. Presumably the investigator analyzes all the evidence found by a close textual comparison. He then considers possible explanations of this evidence, weighing alternatives if these exist. In the present case, the relationship of *The Contention* and *2 Henry VI*, the alternatives do not seem to have been fully considered and a considerable body of evidence has been rather summarily dismissed and, in part, not considered. It has been my purpose to assemble all the evidence which I could find and to assess the possible explanations.

In the course of my investigation I discovered that Professor Albert Feuillerat and I had both independently reached the same general conclusion; but since Professor Feuillerat was dealing with all the plays of Shakespeare it seemed of value for me to proceed. Thus, since I deal with only one pair of plays, I can treat the subject in more detail, and my work may enforce his conclusions.

My thanks are due to my colleagues James M. Osborn, Louis L. Martz, and Helge Kökeritz who have read the manuscript and given me helpful suggestions.

I wish to express my thanks to the American Philosophical Society for a grant which aided in the completion of this book.

For my citations from the texts of the two plays I have used the reprint of Q found in Vol. 9 of *The Cambridge Shakespeare* (ed. W. A. Wright) and the reprint of F found in Lionel Booth's edition of the First Folio. These have been checked against Farmer's facsimile of Q and Lee's facsimile of the Folio. The numbering of Folio lines is that of the Globe edition.

My thanks are due the Cambridge University Press for permission to quote from Peter Alexander's *Shakespeare's Henry VI and Richard III*, and to the Malone Society for allowing me to cite extensive passages from the Society's edition of *Sir Thomas More*.

CHARLES TYLER PROUTY

New Haven, Connecticut

April 23, 1953

CONTENTS

Preface	vii
1. The Problem	1
2. Variations in Playing	6
3. Style	22
4. Character and Structure	54
5. Memorial Reconstruction	71
6. Revision	107
7. Conclusions	120
Appendix: Parallel Passages Cited in the Text	123

Chapter I. THE PROBLEM

From the 18th century until comparatively recent times Shakespeare scholars and critics were generally agreed that 2 and 3 *Henry VI* were not Shakespeare's original creations but were revisions by him of two old plays, *The First Part of the Contention Betwixt the Two Famous Houses of York and Lancaster*, and *The True Tragedy of Richard Duke of York*, both published anonymously by Thomas Millington in 1594 and 1595 respectively. This opinion rested, in the main, on Malone's *Dissertation on the Three Parts of King Henry VI*, wherein a wealth of detail and opinions was recorded, some objective, such as a comparison of texts, and some subjective, such as pronouncements on Shakespeare's style.¹ Although Malone's views were generally accepted, there was considerable disagreement as to the authorship of the two quartos. Malone held that Peele or Greene or both of them were the original authors; later, under Farmer's influence, Malone suspected Marlowe, but subsequently the name of practically every playwright writing before 1594 was suggested.²

Some maintained that Shakespeare had a partial or even complete hand in both *The Contention* and *The True Tragedy*; but there was general concord on the basic premise that the Folio text represented a revision of the Quarto texts. The arguments advanced were frequently nonlogical; there were ex-cathedra pronouncements on what Shakespeare would or would not have written, generalizations about stylistic peculiarities of Shakespeare and other dramatists, and a tremendous marshaling of so-called parallel

1. *The Plays and Poems of William Shakespeare with the Corrections and Illustrations of Various Commentators*, ed. James Boswell (21 vols.; London, 1821), 18, 557-97.

2. Jane Lee's "On the Authorship of the Second and Third Parts of *Henry VI* and Their Originals," in *The New Shakespeare Society's Transactions* 1875-76, pp. 219-79, is a useful summary.

passages which proved only that there was in the 16th century, even as today, no copyright on a host of common expressions. One aspect of the whole discussion was its concern with two not necessarily related problems: (1) the relationship between the quartos and the Folio and (2) the authorship of the quartos. A continuing result of this twofold approach has been a failure to examine the two texts on a reasonably objective basis. Evidence was produced to support a particular point of view, and unfavorable evidence was not considered.

A comparison of the text of *The First Part of the Contention* with the Folio text of 2 *Henry VI* is eminently desirable today, particularly since a new orthodoxy has been established which in its turn presents certain nonlogical arguments and which has not been concerned with all the facts revealed by a detailed examination of the two texts. This new orthodoxy was first stated by Peter Alexander in 1924,³ confirmed, at least in part, by Madeleine Doran in 1928,⁴ and endorsed successively by Sir Edmund Chambers in 1930,⁵ Sir Walter Greg in 1939,⁶ Alfred Hart in 1942,⁷ F. P. Wilson in 1945,⁸ and Dover Wilson in 1952.⁹

Alexander published his initial investigations in 1924 and in 1929 appeared his full-length study wherein he states the following conclusion:

The Contention and *Richard Duke of York* are pirated versions of 2 and 3 *Henry VI*, put together by two of the leading players in Pembroke's Company, after the failure of the tour in 1593. These actors had in their possession certain

3. *Shakespeare's Henry VI and Richard III* (Cambridge, The University Press, 1929).

4. *Henry VI, Parts II and III: Their Relation to "The Contention" and "The True Tragedy,"* Humanistic Studies, Vol. 4, No. 4 (Iowa City, University of Iowa, 1928).

5. *William Shakespeare* (2 vols.; Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1930), I, 281.

6. *The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1942), p. 53.

7. *Stolne and Surreptitious Copies* (Melbourne, University Press, 1942), p. 1.

8. "Shakespeare and the 'New Bibliography,'" *The Bibliographical Society 1892-1942, Studies in Retrospect* (London, 1945), p. 115.

9. *The Second Part of King Henry VI, The New Shakespeare* (Cambridge, The University Press, 1952), p. xvi.

manuscripts or portions of them; and they were no doubt helped in places by some of their fellows; but what they chiefly relied on was the memory, sometimes the possession, of their own parts, and the recollection of the plays as a whole that remained with them from frequent rehearsals and performances.¹⁰

The "certain manuscripts" are described as "a fragmentary transcript of the play," and "In addition . . . smaller fragments which have become detached in some way from the original mass and been embedded in the Quarto."¹¹ The two actors who availed themselves of their memories and the various manuscripts had, according to Alexander, played the parts of Warwick and Suffolk-Clifford; a doubling of the last two parts by one actor is assumed.¹²

Madeleine Doran, though agreeing with the idea of memorial reconstruction, did not think that piracy was the source of the quartos; instead she suggested that they were "acting versions put together largely from memory."¹³ She offered several other modifications of the original theory. First, instead of Alexander's "fragmentary transcript," she preferred the theory that the Folio compositor consulted the printed text of the Quarto when his copy was illegible.¹⁴ Secondly, she suggested that the memorially reconstructed acting version was based on an adaptation of a nonextant original and that the Folio text itself was this original with a few revisions.¹⁵

Sir Edmund Chambers also found it necessary to suggest an adaptation of the original as the source for the Quarto text: "The basis of Q must have been a production for which the original text had been cut. . . . The object of the cutting is not quite clear. Probably a reduction in the time required for presentation was alone in view; there is no reduction in the number of actors needed for the most crowded scenes."¹⁶ Like Miss Doran, Sir Edmund

10. *Op. cit.*, p. 116.

11. *Ibid.*, pp. 86-7.

12. *Ibid.*, p. 75.

13. *Op. cit.*, p. 77.

14. *Ibid.*, p. 83.

15. *Ibid.*, p. 81.

16. *Op. cit.* 1, 284.

rejected the idea of a fragmentary transcript saying, "I do not see any evidence for a fragmentary transcript, or know why any such document should come into existence."¹⁷ While not suggesting that the compositor of the Folio had recourse to the Quarto, Sir Edmund does have other suggestions regarding certain aspects of the text which are not quite satisfactorily explained by Alexander. One of these is the identity of the pirate—Sir Edmund does not follow the possibility of legitimacy—who he thinks was the bookkeeper aided by a "plot." Incidentally, the bookkeeper, he believes, is better on *The True Tragedy* because *3 Henry VI* had perhaps been "more recently on the stage."¹⁸ Finally, Sir Edmund added certain obiter dicta. Regarding the possibility of revision he observes: "Firstly, there is no evidence for any such practice of meticulous stylistic revision in the Elizabethan theatre. Secondly, who could ever have written such a text as Q, which in some places shows the hand of a competent dramatist, and in others is too bad for the veriest stage hack, to say nothing of the competent dramatists to whom it has been ascribed?"¹⁹ Other details are discussed by Sir Edmund, but I think that the foregoing fairly represents his general view of the relationship between the two texts.

Sir Walter Greg and F. P. Wilson were content to endorse the general proposition of memorial reconstruction, without recourse to further hypotheses such as those which Madeleine Doran and Sir Edmund deemed necessary as "buttressing of the 'report' theory."²⁰ The only additional qualification has been another and new identification of the pirate.²¹ Finally, in his New Shakespeare edition of *1, 2 and 3 Henry VI*, Dover Wilson has accepted Alexander's theory, but nonetheless seems to believe in some type of revision.

Although there was some dissent, the cries of renunciation and of "mea culpa" from most of those who had formerly held to the

17. *Ibid.*, p. 283.

18. *Ibid.*

19. *Ibid.*, p. 282.

20. *Ibid.*, p. 284.

21. John Jordan, "The Reporter of *Henry VI, Part 2*," *PMLA*, 64 (1949), 1089-1113.

theory of revision were such, and of such authority, that the new orthodoxy obtained unchallenged sway. When the second edition of *2 Henry VI* in the Arden Shakespeare appeared in 1931, the general editor, R. H. Case, added a note pointing out that the Quarto was merely a bad quarto and not a play which Shakespeare had revised. Practically all texts of the *Henry VI* trilogy take the same position.

In view of the rather revolutionary *volte-face*, it would seem highly desirable to investigate the relationship between the two texts in considerable detail, because our whole concept of Shakespeare's early career has, by this change, been greatly altered. If *The First Part of the Contention* and *The True Tragedy* are merely memorial reconstructions, then Shakespeare early in his career wrote original plays dealing with English history. In fact, at the 1951 Shakespeare Conference in Stratford, F. P. Wilson suggested that Shakespeare was the first dramatist to write popular plays dealing with English history. In short, the memorial reconstruction theory so greatly alters our basic conceptions that a complete study of the available evidence is essential.

In spite of the various recent studies of the play, there remain certain rather large and important variations between the Quarto and Folio which have been neglected or ignored, and these I list in tabular form:

1. Variations in playing indicated by stage directions or the text itself.
2. The existence in the Folio of a style not found in the Quarto.
3. An emphasis on character found only in the Folio.
4. Variation of essential details between the two texts.
5. Variations which seem to be related to the problem of sources.

Chapter 2. VARIATIONS IN PLAYING

In addition to the Jack Cade scenes, 10 other scenes show distinct variation in playing, as represented by the two texts at our disposal. The scenes in question are: I.iii; I.iv; II.iii; III.i; III.ii; III.iii; IV.i; IV.iv; IV.ix; and V.ii. In noting two of these 10 Sir Edmund Chambers observed: "In two scenes, however, of part 2 (i.4; iii.2) a different staging appears to be contemplated by Q and F, and this is not the only indication that the intervention of a reporter does not by itself completely account for the relation of the versions. The basis of Q must have been a production for which the original text had been cut."¹ Just why a shortened version will account for the variations in the two scenes in question is not at all clear. In fact the only evidence we have concerning shortened versions is that the cutting was designed to decrease the number of actors required; but this is not true in the present instance for, as both Sir Edmund and Miss Doran say, the number of actors required is about the same for both Q and F. Therefore on the basis of what we know about Elizabethan dramatic practice,² there is no precedent for, or explanation of, such a shortened adaptation as is assumed for *The First Part of the Contention*. The possibility exists that the hypothesis of shortening is merely a necessary extension of the original hypothesis and is not independent evidence of any kind. An examination of all the scenes in which such variations appear may clarify the problem by assembling the facts that are available. However, in the analysis of any creative work it is not easy to divide the material into isolated categories, so we will consider eight of the 10 scenes in the present chapter, leaving the other two for later consideration, since their

1. *William Shakespeare*, 1, 284.

2. For a full discussion of abridgment see below, pp. 102-6.

major importance belongs to a discussion of style or one of the other topics listed above.

I.iv

The first of the scenes noted by Sir Edmund Chambers as being differently staged in the two texts is that of the conjuring (I.iv), and the variations are so extensive that the two versions are printed for easy reference in the Appendix.

A preliminary problem is that of the orientation of the conjuring scene, which brings Eleanor, Duchess of Gloucester, to her ruin. Certain advance information is given the audience at the conclusion of I.ii in the Folio, where a messenger orders Duke Humphrey to ride to St. Albans to join the King and Queen in falconry. Dame Eleanor promises to follow her husband and then receives Sir John Hume, who is a willing accomplice in her plotting to become Queen. The same information is found in the Quarto, but there the interview with Hum (*sic*) contains details not found in the Folio. For example, Eleanor in Q arranges that the conjuring shall take place while the King and the Court are at St. Albans. Further she says that the site of the ceremonies will be "on the backside of my Orchard heere" (l. 64). In contrast, the Folio has Eleanor say that she will attend the ceremonies "when from Saint Albones we doe make returne" (l. 83). After her exit, Sir John soliloquizes, saying, among other things, that he is in the pay of Suffolk and the Cardinal, whereas in the Quarto only Suffolk is so mentioned. That Suffolk was behind the machinations of Sir John is clearly shown in I.iii of F where Suffolk tells the Queen, "Madame, my selfe haue lym'd a Bush for her [Eleanor]" (l. 91). In the Quarto the reading is,

And as for proud Duke *Humphrey* and his wife,
I haue set lime-twigs that will intangle them, . . . (ll. 66-7)

Nothing is said in either text at this point about the Cardinal being party to the plot against Eleanor. In both details—the time of the ceremonies and the patron of Sir John—the Quarto is correct and the Folio incorrect in view of later events in both versions. The conjuring must take place while Humphrey is at St. Albans for the

hawking, since it is in the scene (II.i), where both these facts are mentioned, that news is brought by Buckingham of Eleanor's evil deeds. Clearly the Duchess has not accompanied her husband to St. Albans, as she has proclaimed in the Folio; she has stayed at home, as she has said she will in the Quarto.

When we compare the two texts we again find the Quarto making better sense than the Folio, as for example, in the opening of the scene. The Quarto has Eleanor come on with the conjurers, give a scroll containing the questions to Sir John, and then go up to the Tower. In contrast, the Folio has Eleanor enter aloft after the ceremonies have begun; there is no mention of the scroll or of any specific questions. In addition, the Folio has a second priest, John Southwell, and removes Sir John Hume from the scene of the exorcism to a position with Eleanor aloft.

The name of the second priest who appears only in F indicates the variety of elements, aside from the main problem of variations in playing, which require comment in practically every scene. In the chronicles this character's name is given as Thomas Southwell, not John. Does the alteration have anything to do with the Thomas Southwell, brother of the Jesuit Robert Southwell, who was executed in 1595? Why does he not appear at all in Q? These are matters relating primarily to the question of sources, but they are implicit because of the variation between the two texts.

The conjuration of the Spirit, however, raises questions of another sort. The Folio gives us only a stage direction:

*Here doe the Ceremonies belonging, and make the Circle,
Bullingbrooke or Southwell reads, Coniuro
te, &c. It Thunders and Lightens
terribly: then the Spirit
riseth.*

In Q the Witch orders Bullenbrooke to

. . . frame a Circle here vpon the earth,
Whilst I thereon all prostrate on my face,
Do talke and whisper with the diuels be low,
And coniure them for to obey my will. (II. 10-13)

Stage directions follow:

She lies downe vpon her face.
Bullenbrooke makes a Cirkle.

Then Bullenbrooke invokes the Spirit:

Darke Night, dread Night, the silence of the Night,
Wherein the Furies maske in hellish troupes,
Send vp I charge you from *Sosetus* lake,
The spirit *Askalon* to come to me,
To pierce the bowels of this Centricke earth,
And hither come in twinkling of an eye,
Askalon, Assenda, Assenda. (ll. 14-20)

The Folio, though lacking this invocation, does contain a reference to night, but this is found in a passage of utterly different meaning. Eleanor has just made her entrance "aloft" and in response to her request for speed in the proceedings Bullingbrooke replies,

Patience, good Lady, Wizards know their times:
Deepe Night, darke Night, the silent of the Night,
The time of Night when Troy was set on fire,
The time when Screech-owles cry, and Bandogs howle,
And Spirits walke, and Ghosts breake vp their Graues;
That time best fits the worke we haue in hand.
Madame, sit you, and feare not: whom wee rayse,
Wee will make fast within a hallow'd Verge. (ll. 18-25)

This speech is immediately followed by the stage direction, "*Here doe the Ceremonies* [etc.]." This shifting from the invocation of the Quarto to the atmosphere passage of the Folio is also marked by a change in style. Although the epithets are somewhat conventional, the Folio's apostrophe to Night has a power and rhythm quite unlike any poetry of the Quarto. As H. C. Hart³ pointed out, the author of F may have had Golding's *Ovid* in mind when writing this passage, but even so it is no paraphrase; it has poetic validity in its own right. The varied rhythm is the

3. *The Second Part of Henry VI*, The Arden Shakespeare (London, 1931), p. 40, note on ll. 18-19.

most obvious characteristic: at first it is short and concludes with the line; then in the Troy reference the whole line rather than a part is a rhythmic unit; and finally, the series of short epithets mounts through two lines to the word "Ghosts," after which it stretches out in somber strength, diminishing, but almost in monotone. A good actor would make the most of a lengthy pause after "Graues" to let the horror have full effect.

It is of value to compare with this Folio passage one unique in the Quarto which tries to create a sense of atmosphere but in a different way and with indifferent results. In F the Spirit is dismissed by a brief command,

Bulling. Discend to Darknesse, and the burning Lake:
False Fiend auoide. (ll. 42-3)

Q, on the other hand, is a bit more rhetorical.

Bullen. Then downe I say, vnto the damned poule.
Where Pluto in his firie Waggon sits.
Ryding amidst the singde and parched smoakes,
The Rode of *Dytas* by the Riuer Stykes,
There howle and burne for euer in those flames,
Rise *Iordaine* rise, and staie thy charming Spels.
Sonnes [Zounds], we are betraide. (ll. 31-7)

Here we have a typically Senecan passage employed in conventional fashion; nothing distinguishes it from many another such description of the infernal regions. It is, in fact, of a piece with the Quarto's invocation, satisfactory verse of no great poetic merit, which depends on references to specific places and persons and lacks the power of suggestion which the Folio passage achieved by general reference, i.e., screech owls, bandogs, spirits, and ghosts.

Still another variant is the identity of the Spirit who answers the questions concerning the respective destinies of King Henry, Suffolk, and Somerset. In Q his name is "Askalon" but in F it is "Asmath." The plot of *1 Tamar Cam* lists as one of its characters "Ascalon, a Spirit," played by Rowley, probably in 1602.⁴ Of

4. *Henslowe Papers*, ed. W. W. Greg (London, 1907), p. 146, l. 28.

Asmath, there is H. C. Hart's suggestion ⁵ that his name may be a variant of "Asmenath, guider of the North" in Greene's *Friar Bacon*. Neither name is, however, frequent in the literature of witchcraft.

Following the departure of "Askalon-Asmath" both texts have York and Buckingham surprise the conjurers and Eleanor, but the ensuing action differs. In the Quarto Buckingham seizes the scroll, which he gives to York, who says that he will show it to the King. At the conclusion of the next scene (the Court at St. Albans and the false miracle of blind Simpcox) Buckingham enters, tells of Eleanor's witchcraft, and gives the scroll to the King who reads the questions and answers. In the Folio the capture of Eleanor and the conjurer is much the same, but a scroll is seized and its contents read aloud by York. In other words, the Spirit's answers are repeated within a very few lines of their original pronouncement. When Buckingham appears before the King in the next scene he does not have the document from which York read. Instead he merely tells of Eleanor and "a sort of naughtie persons"

Raysing vp wicked Spirits from vnder ground,
Demanding of King *Henries* Life and Death,
And other of your Highnesse Priuie Councell,
As more at large your Grace shall vnderstand. (ll. 174-7)

Where in Q Suffolk hears the prediction that he shall die by water and comments on it; here, since the questions and answers are not read, there is no opportunity for him to learn of the prophecy.

Presumably it was the variations in playing and in stage business that led Sir Edmund Chambers to conclude "that the intervention of a reporter does not by itself account for the relation of the versions," and to suggest that "the basis of Q must have been a production for which the original text had been cut." In the absence of any comment on specific details ⁶ by Sir Edmund, it be-

5. *Op. cit.*, p. 40, note on l. 24.

6. It is obvious that the extent of Sir Edmund's book made it impossible for him to discuss such a matter in great detail.

comes necessary to see if the variations which we have observed are explained by such a theory.

First we should note that although the staging of the scene varies in the two texts, there are other differences which must also be considered. For one thing, the Quarto makes better sense than the Folio on several counts. As we have seen, Q gives correctly the time of the conjuration. Further, Q accounts for the scroll containing the questions and explains why the answers were written down, since in her opening speech Eleanor says,

Here sir *Iohn*, take this scrole of paper here,
Wherein is writ the questions you shall aske,
And I will stand vpon this Tower here,
And here the spirit what it saies to you,
And to my questions, write the answeres downe. (ll. 1-5)

In contrast the Folio makes no mention of the scroll whatsoever; all that we know of any document is that York reads the answers aloud—he does not give the questions.

From a dramatic standpoint, the Quarto is superior to the Folio. It avoids the repetition of the prophecies and by transferring the reading of the scroll to the next scene (II.i) achieves a dramatic effect lacking in F. The King reads aloud both the questions and answers in the presence of his Court, and from his own mouth hears of his own deposition. Both Somerset and Suffolk hear their fates foretold, so that the audience knows that each man has knowledge of his destiny.

On one score, that of the poetry, the Folio is superior, but even this mark in its favor hardly explains its faults and makes more difficult the problem of the relationship between the two texts. Cutting might eliminate the apostrophe to Night but neither cutting nor memorial reconstruction explains how the invocation came into being or why the description of the infernal regions appeared. Nor can cutting explain the stylistic variations. Similarly, it is equally difficult to explain the theatrical inferiority of the Folio, let alone the two equally valid names for the Spirit.

II.iii

The variation in playing found in II.iii results from the appearance in the Folio text of the conjurers, the Witch, Sir John Hume, John Southwell, and Bullingbrooke. In a brief judgment the King condemns the Witch to be burned to ashes and the others to be strangled. The stage direction does not mention any specific persons:

*Sound Trumpets. Enter the King and State,
with Guard, to banish the Duchesse.*

The Quarto does not mention the conjurers in either its elaborate stage direction or in the text proper. The nonappearance of these characters eliminates a minor piece of business, but since other scenes contain a larger number of actors than the present, this evidence is not proof of a cutting designed to decrease the number of actors.

III.ii

The second scene noted by Sir Edmund Chambers in which "a different staging appears to be contemplated" is that dealing with the murder of Gloucester (III.ii). The opening of the scene varies so considerably that the two versions will be quoted as a basis of comparison.

THE QUARTO

Then the Curtaines being drawne, Duke *Humphrey* is discovered in his bed, and two men lying on his brest and smothering him in his bed. And then enter the Duke of *Suffolke* to them.

Suffolk. How now sirs, what haue you dispatcht him?

One. I my Lord, hees dead I warrant you.

Suffolke. Then see the cloathes laid smooth about him still,
That when the King comes, he may perceiue
No other, but that he dide of his owne accord.

2. All things is hansome now my Lord.

Suffolke. Then draw the Curtaines againe and get you gone,
And you shall haue your firme reward anon. (ll. 1-8)

Exet murtherers.

THE FOLIO

Enter two or three running ouer the Stage, from the Murther of Duke Humfrey.

1. Runne to my Lord of Suffolke: let him know
We haue dispatcht the Duke, as he commanded.

2. Oh, that it were to doe: what haue we done?
Didst euer heare a man so penitent? *Enter Suffolke.*

1. Here comes my Lord.

Suff. Now Sirs, haue you dispatcht this thing?

1. I, my good Lord, hee's dead.

Suff. Why that's well said. Goe, get you to my House,
I will reward you for this venturous deed:

The King and all the Peeres are here at hand.

Haue you layd faire the Bed? Is all things well,

According as I gaue directions?

1. 'Tis, my good Lord.

Suff. Away, be gone. (ll. 1-14)

The most striking difference which we notice in this comparison is the use of curtains in the Quarto. That these were the curtains of the inner stage or study seems clear from the text. After Suffolk has talked with the murderers, whom we have seen at work, the curtains are closed, and the King, with his Queen, accompanied by his nobles, enters. Suffolk is commanded to fetch Gloucester and, to do so he leaves the stage, returning after a brief interval with the news that Gloucester is dead in his bed. Later, in order that the King may view the body, Warwick says, "Enter his priue chamber my Lord and view the bodie" and a stage direction reads:

Warwicke draws the curtaines and shoves Duke

• *Humphrey* in his bed.

The reference to a privy chamber together with Warwick's act of drawing the curtains almost certainly indicates an inner stage.

So, too, does the murder itself which could only be accomplished by using this curtained area.

The playing of this scene in the Folio exhibits a marked contrast, for there a bed is "put forth" immediately prior to Warwick's invitation to the King to view the body. Thus we do not see the actual murder as we do in the Quarto, nor do we witness the careful preparations of Suffolk to eliminate all traces of violence. As a matter of fact, the stage business of this episode in the Folio is quite awkward. After Warwick enters with the news of Gloucester's death and the violent reaction of the commons, the King dispatches him to view the body and to "comment then vpon his sodaine death." Warwick departs, the King laments, and a stage direction reads:

Bed put forth.

Warwick, who has obviously returned to the stage, although there is no stage direction for his re-entry, at once remarks,

Come hither gracious Soueraigne, view this body. (l. 149)

What subsequently happens to the bed is unknown, for there is no direction for its removal.

Once again it is evident that the Quarto is the more satisfactory; but of far greater importance are the indications that the Quarto text was played in a theater having an inner stage. These argue strongly against Madeleine Doran's theory that the Quarto represents a text used on a provincial tour, since there is no evidence of the existence of provincial theaters having such appurtenances as an inner stage.

III.iii

Another death scene, that of the Cardinal (III.iii) also gives evidence of differences in playing between the two texts. In the Quarto this is introduced by an elaborate stage direction:

Enter King and *Salsbury*, and then the Curtaines be drawne,
and the Cardinall is discouered in his bed, rauing and staring
as if he were madde.

The Folio reads instead:

Enter the King, Salisbury, and Warwicke, to the Cardinal in bed.

From this latter, it is not clear whether the inner stage is being used, but the King's concluding speech seems to indicate that it is.

Close vp his eyes, and draw the Curtaine close,
And let vs all to Meditation. *Exeunt.* (ll. 32-3)

The Quarto does not contain this reference; instead a procession is indicated when the King says,

Go take him hence, and see his funerals be performde. (l. 21)

The action is not the same and both characters and lines are different. There seems to be no reason why Warwick should or should not appear in the scene. His nonappearance in the Quarto does not mean a smaller cast, for he and Salisbury have already appeared on stage together in III.ii.

It would seem that both texts made use of the inner stage, but why Q ends with a procession removing the body and F with the closing of the curtain is not clear, at least from the context.

IV.i

The scene of Suffolk's death once more reveals differences in playing between the two texts, which are printed in parallel form in the Appendix. In the Quarto there is the usual rather full stage direction, but the Folio is content with a somewhat laconic statement.

It will be noted that the Captain of the Quarto is represented in the Folio as a Lieutenant in both speech ascriptions and stage directions, but both characters fulfill the same function, with certain alterations. The Captain of Q proceeds at once to allot the prisoners taken in the recent action to the Master, the Master's Mate, and Water Whickmore. The disguised Suffolk, remembering the prophecy that he will die by "Water," immediately reacts when he hears the fatal "Water Whickmore." In the Folio the Lieutenant allots the three prisoners to the Master, the Mate, and Walter Whitmore, but instead of a response from Suffolk, this text pro-

ceeds with a discussion between the two anonymous prisoners and the Master and Mate as to the sum of their ransoms. When this matter is concluded, Whitmore, for no apparent reason, suddenly speaks, without having been queried as to the Duke's ransom, and announces that his prisoner must die. Through a rather clumsy device Whitmore is led to announce his name and finally Suffolk reacts to the dread word. Why Suffolk did not hear the name when it was first pronounced by the Lieutenant is, in a minor way, as much of a problem as Claudius and the Dumb Show. Certainly the Quarto handles the episode in much more logical fashion.

Although there are a number of highly important variations between the two texts throughout this entire scene, these must be postponed for a later discussion while we limit ourselves to the second variation in playing, the disposition of Suffolk's remains. In Q the Captain gives the final order:

Off with his head, and send it to the Queene,
And ransomelesse this prisoner shall go free,
To see it safe deliuered vnto her.
Come lets goe. *Exet omnes* (ll. 75-8)

The Lieutenant of F has a different final speech.

And as for these whose ransome we haue set,
It is our pleasure one of them depart:
Therefore come you with vs, and let him go. (ll. 139-41)

The first gentleman who is thus supposed to depart and arrange the ransom payments conveniently remains behind and so is at hand when Walter enters with the body, which he casts down saying,

There let his head, and liueless bodie lye,
Vntill the Queene his Mistris bury it. (ll. 142-3)

The gentleman is so touched that he assumes a second task.

O barbarous and bloody spectacle,
His body will I beare vnto the King:
If he reuenge it not, yet will his Friends,
So will the Queene, that liuing, held him deere. (ll. 144-7)

Whether by reason of the Captain's order or the first gentleman's compassion, the Queen, in F, IV.iv, has macabre possession of Suffolk's head as is indicated by the stage direction. Whatever the agency, the two texts represent a different playing of this final episode: in the Quarto the order is given and the audience sees nothing of body or head until IV.iv; in the Folio the body is produced on stage and the reason for its transportation to Court is humanitarian and not deliberate.

IV.iv

Sc. iv of Act IV is represented in the Quarto by 26 lines, and in the Folio by 60. Since this variation in length is accompanied by variations in playing, the two texts will be found in the Appendix where they may be examined in detail.

The scene begins in F with the Queen fondling Suffolk's head and holding it to her "throbbing brest." Neither this speech nor a second addressed to the same object appears in the Quarto, where there is no indication of the dramatic and thematic use made of the head.

Buckingham's absence from this scene in Q accounts for a second variation. In this text a messenger, announcing that the rebels are in Southwark, urges the King to fly to Killingworth. The King immediately takes decisive action, commanding the messenger to bid Buckingham and Clifford raise an army to oppose the rebels. Further, he urges the Queen to hasten with him to Killingworth and urges Lord Say to accompany them, but the latter resolves to stay behind.

In the Folio Buckingham is on stage during this scene and thus the King cannot send a messenger to him with commands to raise an army. Although it is somewhat beyond the scope of our present problem, the fact is that the King of F issues no commands whatsoever. It is Buckingham who suggests Killingworth as a place of refuge and it is Buckingham who, after the second messenger's report of more immediate danger, manages to get the King started for Killingworth. Finally, we should note that in both texts when the rebels finally are captured (IV.ix), it is Buckingham and Clifford who are in charge. Once again we see the Quarto presenting the

correct details as to the capture and necessary information in contrast with the somewhat careless attitude of the Folio.

IV.ix

A similar omission, not of the presence of a character but of the character's function and lines, results in a different playing of IV.ix. This opens in the Quarto with the King inquiring of Somerset for news of Cade. Somerset reports the death of Lord Say and the sack of the city. After a speech each by the King and Queen, Buckingham and Clifford enter "with the Rebels, with halters about their necks." Clifford announces the surrender, but admits, in response to the King's inquiry about "there Captaine," that Cade has fled. The scene ends when the King decides to return to London and offer thanks to God for the victory.

The scene in the Folio varies considerably. Although Somerset is on stage, he is not questioned by the King and his only speech is in a concluding episode not found in Q. According to the stage direction of the Folio the King, Queen, and Somerset appear on the "Tarras." To them enter Buckingham and Clifford, and in a moment, presumably on the main stage below, appear "*Multitudes with Halters about their Neckes.*" Such a division between upper and main stage is perhaps possible in the Quarto, but there the entry of the two lords and the rebels is simultaneous according to the stage direction. It would appear that there was a different playing of the scene in the two texts.

The conclusion of this scene in the Folio presents material not found in Q, but it lacks any reference to a return to London where divine services of thanksgiving are to be held. There is, of course, an obvious reason for this omission, since in F a messenger reports the arrival of York and his troops from Ireland, so that there is little reason for any rejoicing. Actually, this section, found only in the Folio, contains certain rather essential information. First, the King sends Buckingham to meet York; second, he commits Somerset to the Tower in order to anticipate York's charge of the latter's treason. Of course York's appearance in V.i can be regarded as more dramatic if the audience lacks warning that he has returned. On the other hand, the conclusion of the scene in

the Folio changes the mood from one of thanksgiving to one of despair, as exemplified by the King's final lines:

Come wife, let's in, and learne to gouern better
For yet may England curse my wretched raigne. (ll. 48-9)

Thus there is a complete reversal from a spirit of rejoicing in the Quarto to one of impending doom in the Folio. Furthermore, there is no suggestion in the Folio of rejoicing after the King has pardoned the rebels, for immediately the messenger enters with the news of York.

V.ii

The most noticeable variations in V.ii are the order of events and the material unique in Q. In the Quarto the first episode is Richard's triumph over Somerset which in the Folio occurs later—after Young Clifford has borne off his father's body. The second episode of the Quarto, Warwick's challenge to Clifford, is the first in the Folio, and is almost identical in both texts, with one important exception. According to the Quarto Clifford replies to this challenge by speaking from "within" the following lines:

Warwicke stand still, and view the way that Clifford hewes with
his murthering Curtelaxe, through the fainting troopes to
finde thee out.

Warwicke stand still, and stir not till I come.

Neither the stage direction nor these lines appear in the Folio.

Furthermore, the Quarto has two incidents not found in the other text. The first, represented by stage directions and lines, is the fight between Richard and Young Clifford. The latter is leaving the stage with his father's body and the direction indicates the action:

Enter *Richard*, and then *Clifford* laies downe his father, fights
with him, and *Richard* flies away againe.

After Richard's exit, Young Clifford has a speech of four lines before he leaves with his father's body. In F Clifford laments his father's death and takes away the body, but Richard does not ap-

pear. Nor is there any indication in the Folio of the next episode, which exists only in a stage direction in the Quarto.

Alarmes againe, and then enter three or foure, bearing the Duke of *Buckingham* wounded to his tent.

To all the foregoing instances of variations in playing between the two texts, there will be added others found in scenes whose main importance lies in other aspects of our discussion. What we have dealt with thus far is but one part of the whole problem, and it seems best to wait until all the evidence has been presented before concerning ourselves with possible explanations of the relationship of the two texts. Quite different but in some ways more important is the second major variation, the style of the poetry unique in the Folio.

Chapter 3. STYLE

A crux of major importance in the text of the Folio is York's speech concluding I.i. The first 22 lines of this speech have no counterpart in the Quarto, but the remainder is almost identical in the two texts. The one variation, aside from spelling, punctuation, italics, and a misprint of "graffe" for "grapple," is in the third line where the Quarto has instead of "Englands soile," "England." These almost identical passages are explained by Alexander on the grounds that a fragment of MS of the original became "detached in some way from the original mass" and had "been embedded in the Quarto."¹ This suggestion, it will be remembered, was rejected by Madeleine Doran, Sir Edmund Chambers, and Sir Walter Greg.² R. B. McKerrow, seemingly unaware that Miss Doran had suggested such a hypothesis, conjectured that here and elsewhere the Folio compositor consulted the Quarto text, since his own copy was illegible.³ Such a hypothesis does not, however, explain the Folio's "Englands soile" rather than the Quarto's "England."

Much more important is the appearance in the Folio text of the line "*Aniou and Maine* are given to the French," followed 21 lines later by an almost parallel line, "*Aniou and Mainé* both given vnto the French?" If we consider the rhythm and imagery of the first 22 lines in comparison with these same qualities in the remainder of the speech, we shall, I trust, find some rather interesting and suggestive variations. For purposes of analysis it will be well to have these Folio lines at hand.

1. *Shakespeare's Henry VI and Richard III*, p. 87.

2. *Henry VI*, p. 87; Chambers' *William Shakespeare*, p. 283; Greg's *The Editorial Problem*, p. 54.

3. "A Note on the 'Bad Quartos' of 2 and 3 *Henry VI* and the Folio Text," *R. E. S.*, 13 (1937), 70.

Yorke. Aniou and Maine are giuen to the French,
Paris is lost, the state of *Normandie*
 Stands on a tickle point, now they are gone:
 Suffolke concluded on the Articles,
 The Peeres agreed, and *Henry* was well pleas'd,
 To change two Dukedomes for a Dukes faire daughter.
 I cannot blame them all, what is't to them?
 'Tis thine they giue away, and not their owne.
 Pirates may make cheape penyworths of their pillage,
 And purchase Friends, and giue to Curtezans,
 Still reuelling like Lords till all be gone,
 While as the silly Owner of the goods
 Weepes ouer them, and wrings his haplesse hands,
 And shakes his head, and trembling stands aloofe,
 While all is shar'd, and all is borne away,
 Ready to sterue, and dare not touch his owne.
 So *Yorke* must sit, and fret, and bite his tongue,
 While his owne Lands are bargain'd for, and sold:
 Me thinkes the Realmes of England, France, & Ireland,
 Beare that proportion to my flesh and blood,
 As did the fatall brand *Althæa* burnt,
 Vnto the Princes heart of *Calidon*: . . . (ll. 214-35)

The Folio begins York's soliloquy with a flat statement, not an exclamation as in Q. The succeeding lines continue with a series of statements which describe the situation as it has been revealed in the preceding part of the scene. Clearly these are York's reflective utterances and might well be spoken with significant pauses, indicating the process of his reflection. Moreover these lines are not end-stopped; line two runs on into line three, and five into six, and with line seven the first part of the speech is concluded: York has assessed the grievous losses which England has suffered. His thought is now turned to his own attitude.

I cannot blame them all, what is't to them?

'Tis thine they giue away, and not their owne. .

Up to this point in the play nothing has been said of York's claim to the throne, either by him or by any other character, so there is

a peculiar force in the possessive "thine." He does not hope to become King; in his own mind he is the King, as the ensuing pirate figure and its application well demonstrate:

So Yorke must sit, and fret, and bite his tongue,
While his owne Lands are bargain'd for, and sold: . . .

That "his owne Lands" are something more than goods and chattels to York is powerfully enunciated in the concluding figure. The realms of England, France, and Ireland are compared to the fatal brand which, when consumed by fire, brought death to Meleager, Prince of Calydonia; the kingdom is York's very life.

What we have here is a well-unified and well-constructed verse paragraph, beginning with a quiet statement of fact, mounting in emotion with a vivid figure, then momentarily subsiding—"So Yorke must sit, and fret, and bite his tongue,"—only to rise to a cry from the very heart in the final figure.

If we now turn to the remainder of York's soliloquy, those lines which are common to both texts, we find a quite different style and a paucity of imagery.

Aniou and *Maine* both giuen vnto the French?
Cold newes for me: for I had hope of France,
Euen as I haue of fertile Englands soile.
A day will come, when Yorke shall claime his owne,
And therefore I will take the *Neuils* parts,
And make a shew of loue to proud Duke *Humfrey*,
And when I spy aduantage, claime the Crowne,
For that's the Golden marke I seeke to hit:
Nor shall proud Lancaster vsurpe my right,
Nor hold the Scepter in his childish Fist,
Nor weare the Diadem vpon his head,
Whose Church-like humors fits not for a Crowne.
Then Yorke be still a-while, till time do serue:
Watch thou, and wake when others be asleepe,
To prie into the secrets of the State,
• Till *Henrie* surfetting in ioyes of loue,
With his new Bride, & Englands deere bought Queen,
And *Humfrey* with the Peeres be falne at iarres:

Then will I raise aloft the Milke-white-Rose,
 With whose sweet smell the Ayre shall be perfum'd,
 And in my Standard beare the Armes of Yorke,
 To grapple with the house of Lancaster,
 And force perforce Ile make him yeeld the Crowne,
 Whose bookish Rule, hath pull'd faire England downe.

Exit Yorke. (ll. 236-59)

As has been noted, the repeated reference to Anjou and Maine is in the form of an exclamation; the use of "both" instead of "are" is the difference. The next two lines

Cold newes for me: for I had hope of France,
 Euen as I haue of fertile Englands soile.

with the Quarto variant of "England" for "Englands soile" are interesting because they appear again almost exactly in III.i of both texts. After Somerset has reported the loss of France, York observes in Q:

Cold newes for me, for I had hope of *France*,
 Euen as I haue of fertill England. (ll. 34-5)

In the Folio he says:

Cold Newes for me: for I had hope of France,
 As firmly as I hope for fertile England. (ll. 87-8)

This type of repetition is among the criteria, described as "recollections" or "anticipations" by Sir Walter Greg, which are regarded as characteristic of memorial reconstruction.⁴ It is indeed odd to find this sort of thing in both texts.

As we proceed through the speech we realize that there is a rigid end-stopping of all lines, and all are pedestrianly iambic. There seem to be two sections as far as content is concerned. In the first, ending with "Whose church-like humours fits not for a Crowne," York has outlined his plans: he will side with the Nevilles, be friendly with Gloucester, and, when he sees an opportunity, he will seize the crown, which should not be usurped by Lancaster.

4. *Two Elizabethan Stage Abridgments*, Malone Society Extra Volume, 1922, p. 318.

At this point there begins a second plan of action in which York addresses himself, advising guile—"Watch thou, and wake when others be asleepe." Henry will tire of this Queen and Gloucester will be at odds with the other nobles; then York will raise aloft the "Milke-white Rose" in civil war against the house of Lancaster who have now brought England to such a pass. Finally, we should notice certain heavily formal stylistic devices such as the parallelism of beginning three sequent lines with "And," and another three with "Nor."

When we now compare those lines unique in the Folio with those common to both texts, we realize that we have to do with two quite different types of poetry: on the one hand, a carefully developed verse paragraph; and on the other, a competent but pedestrian series of lines which proceed in chronological order. A trenchant revelation of character through imagery appears in the first, and a straightforward announcement of somewhat Machiavellian plans in the second. It is hard to think that the mood and intent of the latter could be confused with, or even stem from, the former. This variation is observable in the passages peculiar to the Folio, where there exists a style superior to that of the Quarto.

In the present case, it would seem that we have to do with just the sort of thing found in *Love's Labours Lost* and other Elizabethan plays. At times an author would revise a passage, marking the older lines for deletion, but the printer, for some reason failing to observe the notation, would proceed to set up both old and new material. There are two examples of this in *Love's Labours Lost* (IV.iii.296-355 and V.ii.826-31, 846-63); five in *Romeo and Juliet* (II.ii.10-11; III.iii.40-3; IV.i.111; V.iii.102-3; and V.iii.108-9); and two in *The Spanish Tragedy* (1602) (second and fifth passages of additions); as well as duplications in *Hamlet* (III.ii.178), and *Troilus and Cressida* (V.iii.113-15; V.x.32-4).

Dover Wilson regards the examples in *Love's Labours Lost* as original drafts and a later revision;⁵ but Sir Walter Greg prefers to think of them as Shakespeare's first and second thoughts in his

⁵ *Love's Labour's Lost*, The New Shakespeare (Cambridge, The University Press, 1923), pp. 105-8.

original draft.⁶ The most recent editor of this play, Richard David, observes, "As will be seen, the differences not only in style but in intention are too great to be included in a single act of composition."⁷

We may well echo these words with reference to York's soliloquy, where the style, imagery, and concept of character found in the first 22 lines are utterly different from, and far superior to, the remainder of the speech. The two parts could not have been written by the same man at the same time, and the external evidence, the absence of the first from Q, is confirmatory. The significance of this will become even more inescapable as we examine other examples of that style which exists only in the Folio text.

One way to approach this problem is to consider where in the play are found those passages illustrative of the superior style in question. Act III of the Quarto has 433 lines out of a total of 1970 for the play as a whole; Act III of the Folio has 828 lines out of a total of 3162; and it is in this act of the Folio that the varied imagery and style are principally found, although they exist elsewhere. Thus almost one-third of the difference in length between the two texts is to be found in this one act alone, and examination of the unique material here requires our consideration.

III.i

Certain aspects of this scene are more properly dealt with under the general heading of "Character and Structure" but it is not always easy to divide the material, because we are dealing with a play, an artistic creation whose parts are interdependent and interacting. As far as possible, however, we shall restrict the discussion to the topic at hand.

The Queen's first speech is a case in point: in F she is trying to convince the King that Gloucester is a threat to the throne. Throughout the scene other characters emphasize the same idea in lines that do not appear in the Quarto. Both the character of the Queen and the dramatic structure of the scene explain the new

6. *The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare*, p. 127.

7. *Love's Labour's Lost*, The Arden Edition (London, 1951), p. xx.

material, but embedded in this are images and other stylistic qualities.

In her first speech the Queen, after pointing out that Gloucester is next in the line of succession—an idea not expressed in the Quarto—advises the King:

Now 'tis the Spring, and Weeds are shallow-rooted,
Suffer them now, and they'l o're-grow the Garden,
And choake the Herbes for want of Husbandry. (ll. 31-3)

Later when Somerset has brought news of the loss of France, York echoes his lines from I.i ("Cold newes, etc.") and then proceeds with lines not in Q.

Thus are my Blossomes blasted in the Bud,
And Caterpillers eate my Leaues away:
But I will remedie this geare ere long,
Or sell my Title for a glorious Graue. (ll. 89-92)

These two garden images remind us at once of *Richard II* (III.iv) when the Queen and her ladies overhear a like analogy between the garden and the state. While there are other instances of garden imagery in Shakespeare, the connection between *2 Henry VI* and *Richard II* is striking, as we may see in the following lines of the Gardener and his man.

Go thou and, like an executioner,
Cut off the heads of too fast growing sprays
That look too lofty in our commonwealth.
All must be even in our government.
You thus employ'd, I will go root away
The noisome weeds which without profit suck
The soil's fertility from wholesome flowers.

Man. Why should we, in the compass of a pale,
Keep law and form and due proportion,
Showing, as in a model, our firm estate,
When our sea-walled garden, the whole land,
Is full of weeds, her fairest flowers chok'd up,
Her fruit trees all unprun'd, her hedges ruin'd,

Her knots disordered, and her wholesome herbs
Swarming with caterpillars? (ll. 33-47)

In this one speech are both of the figures of *2 Henry VI*: weeds choking the garden of the state and caterpillars destroying the plants. This parallel suggests the truly Shakespearean nature of the imagery unique in the Folio, and unlike the routine imagery of the Quarto, which we have seen illustrated in the conjuring scene (I.iv), in York's soliloquy (I.i), and of which more examples will subsequently be adduced.

Another aspect of III.i is the appearance in the Folio of a double attack on Gloucester: one before he comes on stage and a second after he has appeared. The first appears only in the Folio and here again there is imagery of a kind not found in the Quarto. The King, defending his uncle, Gloucester, against the charges of the Queen, Suffolk, the Cardinal, and York, protests:

Our Kinsman *Gloster* is as innocent,
From meaning Treason to our Royall Person,
As is the sucking Lambe, or harmelesse Doue:
The Duke is vertuous, milde, and too well giuen,
To dreame on euill, or to worke my downefall. (ll. 69-73)

The Queen at once picks up these two figures in the next speech.

Ah what's more dangerous, then this fond affiance?
Seemes he a Doue? his feathers are but borrow'd,
For hee's disposed as the hatefull Rauen.
Is he a Lambe? his Skinne is surely lent him,
For hee's enclin'd as is the rauinous Wolues.
Who cannot steale a shape, that meanes deceit? (ll. 74-9)

Here we may observe once more the use in the Folio of imagery to underline a dramatic emphasis. Specific charges have been made against Gloucester; but the attitude of the Queen is summed up in her analysis of the two figures, and immediately Gloucester enters. In essence, the method is the same as that employed in York's soliloquy which ends the first scene of the play. We have learned of the price which the King has paid for his new Queen;

Gloucester has lamented the loss of Anjou and Maine; Salisbury and Warwick are enraged; the Cardinal plots against Gloucester; and York, in 22 lines points out through two images the significance of what has happened. The imagery is functional; it is not merely decorative.

Once Gloucester has been arrested for treason (III.i) he breaks forth in a long speech (26 lines in F; 18 in Q), whose imagery is as powerful in the Folio as it is flaccid in the Quarto. Beginning with the second line, the Folio presents a passage that is typical of Shakespearean imagery; abstractions are personified and become part of a metaphor.

Vertue is choakt with foule Ambition,
And Charitie chas'd hence by Rancours hand;
Foule Subornation is predominant,
And Equitie exil'd your Highnesse Land. (ll. 143-6)

There is no parallel to these lines in the Quarto.

Another passage unique in the Folio, except for variant first and last lines, is the King's lament following the departure of Gloucester under guard.

King. I *Margaret*: my heart is drown'd with griefe,
Whose flood begins to flowe within mine eyes;
My Body round engyrt with miserie:
For what's more miserable then Discontent?
Ah Vnckle *Humfrey*, in thy face I see
The Map of Honor, Truth, and Loyaltie:
And yet, good *Humfrey*, is the houre to come,
That ere I prou'd thee false, or fear'd thy faith.
What lowring Starre now enuies thy estate?
That these great Lords, and *Margaret* our Queene,
Doe seeke subuersion of thy harmelesse Life.
Thou neuer didst them wrong, nor no man wrong:
And as the Butcher takes away the Calfe,
And binds the Wretch, and beats it when it strays,
Bearing it to the bloody Slaughter-house;
Euen so remorselesse haue they borne him hence:
And as the Damme runnes lowing vp and downe,

Looking the way her harmelesse young one went,
 And can doe naught but wayle her Darlings losse;
 Euen so my selfe bewayles good *Glosters* case
 With sad vnhelpefull teares, and with dimn'd eyes;
 Looke after him, and cannot doe him good:
 So mightie are his vowed Enemies.
 His fortunes I will weepe, and 'twixt each groane,
 Say, who's a Traytor? *Gloster* he is none. (ll. 198-222)

While it may be argued that the Quarto is based on a cut version, we shall be guilty of partial argument if we do not examine the Folio lines. In so doing we first observe a run-on rhythm. Secondly, we find the extended figure of the calf led to slaughter, which type of figure, as we have noted before, exists here and elsewhere only in the Folio text. More important is the dramatic function of the speech. The King has allowed his one true and faithful supporter to be charged with treason and to be taken away a prisoner. From this point on, the King is doomed, since he has yielded to the power of the nobles who will in turn fight among themselves until the weakened state will be seized by York. The departure of Gloucester marks a crisis in the play and the King's speech emphasizes that fact both to the King and to the audience. As Henry says, his uncle's face was "the Map of Honor, Truth, and Loyaltie," and never has Gloucester been false; but Margaret and the lords have triumphed. Finally, the King's present state is somewhat pathetically portrayed by the calf image, which is functional in its vivid statement of a change in fortune. The King has lost his power and can only "Looke after him, and cannot doe him good," even as the helpless dam. Structurally, this is similar to the first 22 lines of York's soliloquy: a statement of fact is followed by a metaphorical illustration of the significance to the speaker, ending with another figure defining the conclusion.

With this, the King leaves the stage; the plotting and quarreling begin. The first order of business is the elimination of Gloucester, as the Queen says in the Quarto,

Then sit we downe againe my Lord Cardinall,
 Suffolke, Buckingham, Yorke, and Somerset.

Let vs consult of proud Duke Humphries fall.
 In mine opinion it were good he dide,
 For safetie of our King and Common-wealth. (ll. 111-15)

Quite different in style and tone is the corresponding speech in the Folio:

Queene. Free Lords:

Cold Snow melts with the Sunnes hot Beames:
Henry, my Lord, is cold in great Affaires,
 Too full of foolish pittie: and *Glosters* shew
 Beguiles him, as the mournefull Crocodile
 With sorrow snares relenting passengers;
 Or as the Snake, roll'd in a flowring Banke,
 With shining checker'd slough doth sting a Child,
 That for the beautie thinkes it excellent.
 Beleeue me Lords, were none more wise then I,
 And yet herein I iudge mine owne Wit good;
 This *Gloster* should be quickly rid the World,
 To rid vs from the feare we haue of him. (ll. 223-34)

The two figures which the Queen uses to describe Gloucester are in themselves extremely well handled. Economy and compression give a full effect in brief compass. Spenser, in dealing with the well-known proclivities of the crocodile, requires a stanza which says no more than does this line and a half. The snake figure is equally compressed and equally suggestive. The free rhythm is a significant factor, for these lines are not end-stopped: each figure is in itself a rhythmic period. This imagery, though different from those which we have hitherto examined, has the same superiority to the Quarto imagery. Moreover, there is a dramatic value in the use of such figures at this point; they answer the King's concluding speech. The innocent Gloucester is not as he seems; death lurks behind that fair-seeming countenance. The antithesis is well worked out, particularly with the snake's sloughed skin image, which appears elsewhere in Shakespeare in a joyful sense, as when Oberon describes the bank where the wild thyme grows,

There sleeps Titania sometime of the night,
 Lull'd in these flowers with dances and delight;
 And there the snake throws his enamell'd skin,
 Weed wide enough to wrap a fairy in; . . . (II.i.253-6)

The sudden reversal of this happy figure, the stinging of a child entranced by the castoff skin, presents a dramatic contrast to that of the helpless calf in the hands of the butcher.

Much more obvious are the subsequent figurative representations of the antithesis by which the lords describe Gloucester as Lord Protector. York, in Folio, agrees to the elimination of Gloucester, saying,

Wer't not all one, an emptie Eagle were set,
 To guard the Chicken from a hungry Kyte,
 As place Duke *Humfrey* for the Kings Protector? (ll. 248-50)

Suffolk also thinks that Gloucester would murder the King and likens the Protector to a fox guarding the sheepfold who must be killed "Before his Chaps be stayn'd with Crimson blood." A fox figure does appear in the Quarto, but it is a different one and is not extended; a one-line proverb is all we find:

The Foxe barks not when he would steale the Lambe, . . .
 (l. 121)

Even such a minor character as a messenger uses striking imagery in the Folio, but not in the Quarto. After the murder of Gloucester is agreed upon, a messenger arrives in Q with the news of rebellion in Ireland under the leadership of the "wilde Onele." The messenger of the Folio text also announces the rebellion, but quite properly says nothing about O'Neal, for none of that name led a rebellion against the English until 1560. None of the chronicles mention a leader of the Irish rebels in the time of Henry VI, but all do mention O'Neal in connection with the 1560 uprising. The actual lines of the Folio messenger are, however, our present purpose.

Great Lords, from Ireland am I come amaine,
 To signifie, that Rebels there are vp,

And put the Englishmen vnto the Sword.
 Send Succours (Lords) and stop the Rage betime,
 Before the Wound doe grow vncurable;
 For being greene, there is great hope of helpe. (ll. 282-7)

In sharp contrast is the Quarto:

Madame I bring you newes from Ireland,
 The wilde Onele my Lords, is vp in Armes,
 With troupes of Irish Kernes that vncontrold,
 Doth plant themselues within the English pale. (ll. 132-5)

The question of who will lead English forces against the Irish rebels is an occasion for acrimony even as is the question of the regency in France. The evils attendant on Gloucester's overthrow are becoming only too apparent, and the Queen attempts to mediate between York and Somerset, using in the Folio a most apt figure:

Nay then, this sparke will proue a raging fire,
 If Wind and Fuell be brought, to feed it with:
 No more, good *Yorke*; sweet *Somerset* be still. (ll. 302-4)

Needless to say, the image, with its prophetic implication, does not appear in the Quarto.

A minor variation between the texts is found in the identity of certain speakers. According to the Quarto, Buckingham is to provide the soldiers for York's expedition. The Folio assigns this task to Suffolk and presents the Cardinal as giving the order instead of the Queen:

My Lord of Yorke, trie what your fortune is:
 Th'vnciuill Kernes of Ireland are in Armes,
 And temper Clay with blood of Englishmen. (ll. 309-11)

The Cardinal has no lines in this episode according to the Quarto, and again a vivid and compressed image does not appear in that text.

The scene ends with another soliloquy by York which is 53 lines in F and 24 in Q. At least 35 lines of the Folio are unique, having no connection with anything in the Quarto, while the Quarto has

certain unique lines of its own. The stylistic variations will be more easily treated if we deal with the soliloquy in parts rather than as a whole, so we begin with the first 25 lines of F.

Yorke. Now *Yorke*, or neuer, steele thy fearfull thoughts,
And change misdoubt to resolution;
Be that thou hop'st to be, or what thou art;
Resigne to death, it is not worth th'enioying:
Let pale-fac't feare keepe with the meane-borne man,
And finde no harbor in a Royall heart.
Faster thē Spring-time showres, comes thoght on thoght,
And not a thought, but thinkes on Dignitie.
My Brayne, more busie then the laboring Spider,
Weaues tedious Snares to trap mine Enemies.
Well Nobles, well: 'tis politikely done,
To send me packing with an Hoast of men:
I feare me, you but warme the starued Snake,
Who cherisht in your breasts, will sting your hearts.
'Twas men I lackt, and you will giue them me; . . .

(ll. 331-45)

The first four lines of Q end with this idea of a lack of man power:

York. Now *York* bethink thy self and rowse thee vp,
Take time whilst it is offered thee so faire,
Least when thou wouldst, thou canst it not attaine,
'Twas men I lackt, and now they giue them me, . . .

(ll. 169-72)

Only two statements, each a single line in length, of the Quarto text are paralleled in the first 25 lines of the Folio. In both texts York urges himself to action and expresses the belief that his chief deficiency—man power—has been remedied by the Irish expedition. The remaining 23 lines of the Folio are divided into two sections, the first being concerned with preparations for action and the second with the action itself.

In dealing with his preparations York considers several different issues in a reflective vein. First, he casts aside his doubts in favor of resolution. These six lines are of a piece. There is clearly a break

or a pause after the second and fourth lines, indicating the initial statement, the issue presented, and in lines five and six, the resolution itself. Resolved, York thinks on the future, the dignity that shall be his, plots against his enemies, and then expresses the realization that he now has soldiers at his disposal. The figures which are used in these lines apply to the separate thoughts of which the passage is constructed. Pale-fond fear, the harboring of the hart, springtime showers, the laboring spider, and the starved snake—all these enhance and emphasize the varied but sequential thoughts which come trooping through York's mind. If we look back to the soliloquy at the end of I.i, we recognize this same reflective quality, analyzing the situation. The audience understands the character and the dramatic situation because of this assessment.

Having resolved, plotted, and found himself with what he lacked, York foretells his plans, as we learn from the following lines unique in F.

I take it kindly: yet be well assur'd,
 You put sharpe Weapons in a mad-mans hands.
 Whiles I in Ireland nourish a mightie Band,
 I will stirre vp in England some black Storme,
 Shall blowe ten thousand Soules to Heauen, or Hell:
 And this fell Tempest shall not cease to rage,
 Vntill the Golden Circuit on my Head,
 Like to the glorious Sunnes transparant Beames,
 Doe calme the furie of this mad-bred Flawe. (ll. 346-54)

The central image of this passage is "some black Storme" and the elaboration is expressed in two units: first, the storm's destruction and second, its continuity and effect. This latter is a rhythmic period of four lines that rises to the crown itself, "Like to the glorious Sunnes transparant Beames," and falls slowly away as the fury is calmed. Here is, in effect, the issue of the whole sequence of the history plays, "That sweet fruition of an earthly crown" which so many desire and for which men subvert order and destroy God's anointed. The Folio gives not only the thought, but more important, it expresses that thought with a soaring

imagery and a rhythm which breaks the bonds of the individual line.

The remainder of the Folio soliloquy is devoted to a description of Cade and of York's plan to use him as the leader of a rebellion in England. The Quarto has the rebellion but not the description, which is a most curious and interesting passage.

In Ireland haue I seene this stubborne *Cade*
 Oppose himselfe against a Troupe of Kernes,
 And fought so long, till that his thighes with Darts
 Were almost like a sharpe-quill'd Porpentine:
 And in the end being rescued, I haue seene
 Him capre vpright, like a wilde Morisco,
 Shaking the bloody Darts, as he his Bells.
 Full often, like a shag-hayr'd craftie Kerne,
 Hath he conuersed with the Enemie,
 And vndiscouer'd, come to me againe,
 And giuen me notice of their Villanies.
 This Deuill here shall be my substitute;
 For that *Iohn Mortimer*, which now is dead,
 In face, in gate, in speech he doth resemble.
 By this, I shall perceiue the Commons minde,
 How they affect the House and Clayme of *Yorke*.
 Say he be taken, rackt, and tortured;
 I know, no paine they can inflict vpon him,
 Will make him say, I mou'd him to those Armes.
 Say that he thriue, as 'tis great like he will,
 Why then from Ireland come I with my strength,
 And reape the Haruest which that Rascall sow'd.
 For *Humfrey*; being dead, as he shall be,
 And *Henry* put apart: the next for me. (ll. 360-83)

From the historical point of view ⁸ this is sheer fantasy. Neither York nor Cade had been in Ireland, and as for Cade's superhuman

8. There is no authority in the chronicles for this, although I. i. 194-5 also mention this rebellion which York quelled. Holinshed on the authority of *Polychronicon* says that Cade was an Irishman (3, 632), but there is nothing about Cade's feats in battle.

feats in battle or his espionage among the Irish kerns, these too have no foundation in fact. What is interesting for our purposes is the poetic quality of the description. The rhythm is of a piece, with each figure running from line to line without a pause, and the images themselves are particularly vivid. Cade, in battle with the kerns, receives so many of their darts that he resembles a porcupine; rescued, he dances for joy like a Morris dancer; and, disguised like a "shag-hayr'd craftie Kerne" he spies upon the enemy. Truly these performances well qualify him for York's final definition, "This Deuill here shall be my substitute." In rhythm, imagery, and structure the soliloquy contains qualities not found in the relevant sections of the Quarto or elsewhere in that text.

III.ii

Scene ii of Act III contains several episodes other than that of Gloucester's murder which has already been discussed. Properly, the bulk of this scene is concerned with character; but, as has been observed earlier, it is not always easy neatly to categorize. At least one speech by Queen Margaret seems to lie a bit more in the realm of style than in any other. The King, lamenting Gloucester, turns his back upon his Queen, who in turn laments her own sad case as one spurned by her lord. In the Quarto this complaint occupies seven lines; in the Folio 48. The unique material of the latter is principally imagery designed to emphasize the rigors of the Queen's original journey to England, wherein her desire to reach the wished coast is sharply contrasted with the reception she has since received at the hands of her royal spouse. Among other things, she herein refers to herself as "Eliador," although we know from the play, as well as from history, that her name was truly Margaret.

Be woe for me, more wretched then he is.
 What, Dost thou turne away, and hide thy face?
 I am no loathsome Leaper, looke on me.
 What? Art thou like the Adder waxen deafe?
 Be poysonous too, and kill thy forlorne Queene.
 Is all thy comfort shut in Glosters Tombe?
 Why then Dame *Eliador* was neere thy ioy.

Erect his Statue, and worship it,
And make my Image but an Ale-house signe.
Was I for this nye wrack'd vpon the Sea,
And twice by aukward winde from Englands banke
Droue backe againe vnto my Natiue Clime.
What boaded this? but well fore-warning winde
Did seeme to say, seeke not a Scorpions Nest,
Nor set no footing on this vnkinde Shore.
What did I then? But curst the gentle gusts,
And he that loos'd them forth their Brazen Caues,
And bid them blow towards Englands blessed shore,
Or turne our Sterne vpon a dreadfull Rocke:
Yet Æolus would not be a murtherer,
But left that hatefull office vnto thee.
The pretty vaulting Sea refus'd to drowne me,
Knowing that thou wouldst haue me drown'd on shore
With teares as salt as Sea, through thy vnkindnesse.
The splitting Rockes cower'd in the sinking sands,
And would not dash me with their ragged sides,
Because thy flinty heart more hard then they,
Might in thy Pallace, perish *Elia*nor.
As farre as I could ken thy Chalky Cliffes,
When from thy Shore, the Tempest beate vs backe,
I stood vpon the Hatches in the storme:
And when the duskie sky, began to rob
My earnest-gaping-sight of thy Lands view,
I tooke a costly Iewell from my necke,
A Hart it was bound in with Diamonds,
And threw it towards thy Land: The Sea receiu'd it,
And so I wish'd thy body might my Heart:
And euen with this, I lost faire Englands view,
And bid mine eyes be packing with my Heart,
And call'd them blinde and duskie Spectacles,
For loosing ken of *Albions* wished Coast.
How often haue I tempted Suffolkes tongue
(The agent of thy foule inconstancie)
To sit and watch me as *Ascanius* did,

When he to madding *Dido* would vnfold
 His Fathers Acts, commenc'd in burning Troy.
 Am I not witcht like her? Or thou not false like him?
 Aye me, I can no more: Dye, *Elinor*,
 For *Henry* weepes, that thou dost liue so long. (ll. 73-121)

Margaret-Eliador's first reaction is one of immediate desperation when the King, turning his back upon her, seems deaf to her pleas. First, she identifies him with the adder who was notoriously deaf and whom she urges to kill his forlorn Queen. Since all his love is for Gloucester and none for her, let her image become an ale-house sign while the King worships Gloucester's.

In two extended figures she then deals with her journey to England: the first has to do with the failure of sea, wind, and rocks to take her life; the second, with her own reactions as her ship was blown back from sight of English soil. There is in each a clearly developed structure with a certain parallelism between the two. In the first, the idea is twice stated: although she cursed Æolus for the storms he had sent upon her, the sea refused to drown her, leaving that task to her own tears of sorrow at Henry's unkindness. Similarly the rocks did not destroy her, but left that task to Henry's flinty heart.

In contrast with what was to be her fate in England, Margaret, in the second figure, reveals her great love for Henry. Storm tossed, she viewed the receding chalky cliffs and as they were lost to sight she symbolically cast into the sea a jeweled heart bound in with diamonds, hoping that even as the sea received the heart, so Henry might receive hers. The land lost to view, she, like Dido listening to Ascanius, heard from Suffolk of Henry, but as Dido was bewitched so is she, and as Æneas was faithless, so is Henry.⁹

These doubled figures are not mere adornment; thematically they are two aspects of Margaret's love for Henry, and structurally

9. Dover Wilson, in his edition of the play, points out that no one who had read the *Æneid* either in translation or in the original could have written this passage, because in Vergil it is Cupid disguised as Ascanius who lies in Dido's bosom and it is Æneas himself who tells her of his adventures. A confused understanding of an ambiguous passage in Chaucer's *Legend of Good Women* seems to be the source of the passage.

they make vivid the sequence of events. In sight of England, Margaret's ship was driven back by storms. Her first act, as the shore receded, was to cast the jewel into the sea; and, out of sight of land, she besought Suffolk to talk to her of King Henry. Then too we should observe the run-on lines which are a functional part of the rhythmic pattern that is characteristic in Shakespeare's verse and is absent from the work of his predecessors and from the Quarto.

As the scene continues, the King, Warwick, and Salisbury speak in that rhythmic pattern which we have noted as existing only in the Folio. In all these speeches there is a use of extended imagery. The King would drain an ocean of salt tears on dead Gloucester's face to tell his love. Warwick compares the unnatural symptoms exhibited by Gloucester's corpse with their antitheses found in a natural death, and in this comparison there is still another effective image:

Oft haue I seene a timely-parted Ghost,
Of ashy semblance, meager, pale, and bloodlesse,
Being all descended to the labouring heart,
Who in the Conflict that it holds with death,
Attracts the same for aydance 'gainst the enemy,
Which with the heart there cooles, and ne're returneth,
To blush and beautifie the Cheeke againe. (ll. 161-7)

In a different vein is an outburst by Suffolk later in this same scene after he has been banished. We should note particularly that this speech is practically the same in both Q and F.

Suf. A plague vpon them: wherefore should I curse them?
Would curses kill, as doth the Mandrakes grone,
I would inuent as bitter searching termes,
As curst, as harsh, and horrible to heare,
Deliuier'd strongly through my fixed teeth,
With full as many signes of deadly hate,
As leane-fac'd enuy in her loathsome caue.
My tongue should stumble in mine earnest words,
Mine eyes should sparkle like the beaten Flint,
Mine haire be fixt an end, as one distract:

I, euery ioynt should seeme to curse and ban,
 And euen now my burthen'd heart would breake
 Should I not curse them. Poyson be their drinke.
 Gall, worse then Gall, the daintiest that they taste:
 Their sweetest shade, a groue of Cypresse Trees:
 Their cheefest Prospect, murd'ring Basiliskes:
 Their softest Touch, as smart as Lizards stings:
 Their Musicke, frightfull as the Serpents hisse,
 And boading Screech-Owles, make the Consort full.
 All the foule terrors in darke seated hell——(ll. 309-28)

The end-stopping, the trite epithets, and the phrasing of tongue, eyes, and hair and shade, prospect, touch, and music are all characteristic of that poetry which reached dramatic success in *The Spanish Tragedy*. One dogma of such poets as Gascoigne and Turberville was that if one epithet was good it would really improve the poem. Hieronimo's "O eyes, no eyes" is better dramatically than this outburst by Suffolk, but Kyd and the author of these lines were far less developed poets than he who wrote the poetry unique in the Folio.

In fact a comparison of Suffolk's lines with any of those passages which have been cited from the Folio text alone demonstrates a well-known critical truth regarding the nature of Shakespeare's poetry. Before Shakespeare, dramatic poetry was based on the single iambic line: Shakespeare gave to dramatic blank verse the rhythmic period which rises and falls independent of the iambic pentameter unit. This rhythm which appears in the Folio text is so at variance with the style of the Quarto and those passages common to both texts that we may reasonably conclude that one author at one time did not write in both styles. Even though we may hypothecate corruption by a reporter, we must face the problem raised by the stylistic qualities of such a speech as Suffolk's. It is impossible in this instance to hypothecate further, saying that the Folio compositor set from the Quarto, since the variants show a different copy for the two texts.

In the remainder of the scene, the last farewell of the Queen and Suffolk, the two texts differ markedly in style, even though

there are frequent correspondences of individual lines. The Quarto is completely end-stopped, while the Folio has the more sophisticated rhythm.

III.iii

In even such a brief scene as that of the Cardinal's death, the Folio presents imagery not found in Q. For example, the Cardinal, in reply to the King's inquiry as to his health, cries out in delirium.

If thou beest death, Ile giue thee Englands Treasure,
Enough to purchase such another Island,
So thou wilt let me liue, and feele no pain. (ll. 2-4)

This identification of the King as the figure of death produces a dramatic effect lacking in the Quarto where the scene begins with the Cardinal exclaiming

Oh death, if thou wilt let me liue but one whole yeare,
Ile giue thee as much gold as will purchase such another Iland.
(ll. 1-2)

It is, of course, easy to say that a reporter garbled these lines, but as we proceed we shall see in the Cardinal's second speech further instances of an imagery unique in the Folio, and it is in this light of uniqueness that we must consider the evidence of the imagery, for it demonstrates clearly something more purposeful than mere capricious memory. Either someone very carefully excised all occurrences of one type of imagery or a reviser reworded the rather crude materials. The speech in question poses the problem very aptly. It is a continuation of the Cardinal's delirium.

Bring me vnto my Triall when you will.
Dy'de he not in his bed? Where should he dye?
Can I make men liue where they will or no?
Oh torture me no more, I will confesse.
Aliue againe? Then shew me where he is,
Ile giue a thousand pound to looke vpon him.
He hath no eyes, the dust hath blinded them.
Combe downe his haire; looke, looke, it stands vpriight,

Like Lime-twigs set to catch my winged soule:
 Giue me some drinke, and bid the Apothecarie
 Bring the strong poyson that I bought of him. (ll. 8-18)

In contrast, the Quarto is unadorned and lacks the heightened dramatic tension of the Folio.

Why died he not in his bed?
 What would you haue me to do then?
 Can I make men liue whether they will or no?
 Sirra, go fetch me the strong poison which the Pothicary sent
 me.
 Oh see where duke Humphreys ghoast doth stand,
 And stares me in the face. Looke, looke, coame downe his
 haire,
 So now hees gone againe: Oh, oh, oh. (ll. 5-11)

While both speeches have the same disjointed staccato pattern, the vivid imagery of the Folio—the eyes blinded by the dust of the grave and the hair set like lime twigs to entrap the Cardinal's wingèd soul—enhances the horror of the guilty man's death and renders the scene more effective theatrically.

It is, then, the poetry of a functional and dramatic quality which accounts for the variation in length between the two versions of Act III, and the bulk of this poetry is clearly differentiated from the verse of the Quarto by its rhythm and imagery. In Act IV, where the variation between the two texts is 365 lines, both poetry and prose figure, since here we have the entire Cade episode. Only three scenes of this act deal with the major characters, but even so, over one-third of the unique Folio material is found in them, and here again we may see those poetic qualities that were found in Act III.

IV.i

Notice has already been given to the capture and death of Suffolk in the chapter devoted to variations in playing, but the scene is equally important to the present consideration, because it contains, in the Folio version, several examples of the imagery with which we have been concerned. The first seven lines, which are

unique in F, are a rather elaborate indication of the time of day and further, in the description of night, set the tone for the murder which is to follow.

Lieu. The gaudy blabbing and remorsefull day,
Is crept into the bosome of the Sea:
And now loud houlung Wolues arouse the Iades
That dragge the Tragicke melancholy night:
Who with their drowsie, slow, and flagging wings
Cleape dead-mens graues, and from their misty Iawes,
Breath foule contagious darknesse in the ayre: . . . (ll. 1-7)

Both the movement of the verse and the imagery belong with that considerable body of poetry which exists only in the Folio text. The seven lines are a short verse paragraph with a very clear rhythmic quality that transcends lineation. The principal figure, that of the dragons who draw Night's chariot, extends over five lines, and is noteworthy for its effective blending of sound and meaning.

An instance of metaphorical personification is also found in the scene at hand. Whitmore, resolving on vengeance for his lost eye, has a five-line speech (ll. 39-43).

Neuer yet did base dishonour blurre our name,
But with our sword we wip'd away the blot.
Therefore, when Merchant-like I sell reuenge,
Broke be my sword, my Armes torne and defac'd,
And I proclaim'd a Coward through the world. (ll. 39-43)

The figures here are compact but give great force and enhanced meaning to the utterance.

By far the longest passage of unique material is found in the speech of the Lieutenant who upbraids Suffolk for his various crimes (ll. 70-103). The first eight lines of this appear at least in part in Q, but it is interesting that F, even here, contains two images not in the other text.

Lieu. Poole, Sir Poole? Lord,
I kennell, puddle, sinke, whose filth and dirt
Troubles the siluer Spring, where England drinks:

Now will I dam vp this thy yawning mouth,
 For swallowing the Treasure of the Realme.
 Thy lips that kist the Queene, shall sweepe the ground:
 And thou that smil'dst at good Duke *Humfries* death,
 Against the senselesse windes shall grin in vaine, . . .
 (ll. 70-8)

Punning on Suffolk's surname, Poole, the Lieutenant describes him as puddle "whose filth and dirt/Troubles the siluer spring where England drinkes," and shortly vows to stop up his mouth "For swallowing the Treasure of the Realme." Thus in five lines the Folio has two figures which, though somewhat disparate, give strength and color to the charge against Suffolk and are characteristic of the happy flow of Shakespeare's invention.

From line 28 on, the Folio presents material for which there is no counterpart in Q, and here again we find the run-on rhythm that marks the unique poetry of F. The substance of this is the charges against Suffolk ending with the stirrings of rebellion by the peers, York, and the commons of Kent. In spite of this rather factual material the verse has considerable texture, as for example the comment on York's impending rebellion.

And now the House of Yorke thrust from the Crowne,
 By shamefull murder of a guiltlesse King,
 And lofty proud incroaching tyranny,
 Burnes with reuenging fire, whose hopefull colours
 Aduance our halfe-fac'd Sunne, striuing to shine;
 Vnder the which is writ, *Inuitis nubibus*. (ll. 94-9)

IV.iv

A somewhat different style is found in the unique Folio material of IV.iv, the second scene of this act to deal with the major characters. In a rather macabre piece of business the Queen fondles the head of Suffolk.

Oft haue I heard that greefe softens the mind,
 And makes it fearefull and degenerate,
 Thinke therefore on reuenge, and cease to weepe.
 But who can cease to weepe, and looke on this.

Heere may his head lye on my throbbing brest:
But where's the body that I should imbrace? (ll. 1-6)

This is routine poetry depending on rhetorical devices rather than imagery. The repetition of "cease to weepe" in line four and the antithesis of "Heere" and "where's" in the last two lines are reminiscent of the poetry of the 80's. The passage is too brief, however, to allow of any certain conclusion.

V.i

Act V, although the shortest of the play in both texts, is also worthy of notice, for once again the Folio contains poetry not found in the Quarto. In the first scene, York returns from Ireland with his soldiers. Scattered throughout are lines and passages unique in F, and while it is not feasible to examine the scene in its entirety, we can assess the quality of the poetry by examination of a few examples.

Confronted by Buckingham, who demands the reason for his appearance in force, York breaks out in an aside.

Scarse can I speake, my Choller is so great.
Oh I could hew vp Rockes, and fight with Flint,
I am so angry at these abiect tearmes.
And now like *Aiæx Telamonius*,
On Sheepe or Oxen could I spend my furie.
I am farre better borne then is the king:
More like a King, more Kingly in my thoughts.
But I must make faire weather yet a while,
Till *Henry* be more weake, and I more strong. (ll. 23-31)

The obvious overstatement of this is in noticeable contrast with the restraint and reflection of the Folio material in York's two soliloquies (I.i and III.i); also lacking is an organic unity which gave a structural development to those soliloquies. On the other hand, the Quarto gives but a hint of York's anger, and makes no mention of his aspiration to the throne.

Oh how I hate these spitefull abiect termes,
But Yorke dissemble, till thou meete thy sonnes, . . .
(ll. 15-16)

A bit later when the Queen enters with Somerset York breaks forth again.

How now? is Somerset at libertie?
 Then Yorke vnloose thy long imprisoned thoughts,
 And let thy tongue be equall with thy heart.
 Shall I endure the sight of Somerset?
 False King, why hast thou broken faith with me,
 Knowing how hardly I can brooke abuse?
 King did I call thee? No: thou art not King:
 Not fit to gouerne and rule multitudes,
 Which dar'st not, no nor canst not rule a Traitor.
 That Head of thine doth not become a Crowne:
 Thy Hand is made to graspe a Palmers staffe,
 And not to grace an awefull Princely Scepter.
 That Gold, must round engirt these browes of mine,
 Whose Smile and Frowne, like to *Achilles* Speare
 Is able with the change, to kill and cure.
 Heere is a hand to hold a Scepter vp,
 And with the same to acte controlling Lawes:
 Giue place: by heauen thou shalt rule no more
 O're him, whom heauen created for thy Ruler. (ll. 87-105)

The Quarto is very weak in comparison:

Yorke. Whose that, proud Somerset at libertie?
 Base fearefull Henry that thus dishonor'st me,
 By heauen, thou shalt not gouerne ouer me:
 I cannot brooke that Traitors presence here,
 Nor will I subiect be to such a King,
 That knowes not how to gouerne nor to rule,
 Resigne thy Crowne, proud Lancaster to me,
 That thou vsurped hast so long by force,
 For now is Yorke resolu'd to claime his owne,
 And rise aloft into faire Englands Throane. (ll. 72-81)

As the tension between the Yorkists mounts, Richard taunts Clifford in lines that have no parallel whatsoever in Q.

Oft haue I seene a hot ore-weening Curre,
 Run backe and bite, because he was with-held,
 Who being suffer'd with the Beares fell paw,
 Hath clapt his taile, betweene his legges and cride,
 And such a peece of seruice will you do,
 If you oppose your selues to match Lord Warwicke.

(ll. 151-6)

Following this, the Folio has 40 lines of dialogue between the King and Salisbury on the question of the subject's allegiance to his sovereign, and of this there is no hint in Q. A relatively brief quotation will indicate the nature of the poetry.

Old Salsbury, shame to thy siluer haire,
 Thou mad misleader of thy brain-sicke sonne,
 What wilt thou on thy death-bed play the Ruffian?
 And seeke for sorrow with thy Spectacles?
 Oh where is Faith? Oh, where is Loyalty?
 If it be banisht from the frostie head,
 Where shall it finde a harbour in the earth?
 Wilt thou go digge a graue to finde out Warre,
 And shame thine honourable Age with blood? (ll. 162-70)

The function of this episode and its poetry is to point dramatically the crisis which has arisen. Armed rebellion by those who have sworn allegiance to King Henry will soon break out. All the action subsequent to the elimination of Gloucester has now come to a head, with the imminence of civil war, and there will be no peace for England. Such a situation demands full dramatic emphasis if the audience is to feel the power of the play. Thus we may see the reason for the Folio material: York's anger, though temporarily hidden, rages openly with the appearance of Somerset. That this anger will lead to a defiant claim of the throne has been stated in a short passage at the beginning of the scene.

Let them obey, that knowes not how to Rule.
 This hand was made to handle nought but Gold.
 I cannot giue due action to my words,
 Except a Sword or Scepter ballance it.

A Scepter shall it haue, haue I a soule,
On which Ile tosse the Fleure-de-Luce of France. (ll. 6-11)

The poetry of the Folio in this scene, while not rising to the superior level of other unique examples, does fulfill a dramatic function in building toward the climax of civil insurrection. Such integration we have seen before in the Folio text but not in the Quarto.

V.ii

As we have noted, there are distinct variations in the playing of V.ii, and along with them are manifest differences in poetry, the Folio containing a long speech by Young Clifford of exceptional poetic merit. At first Clifford laments the rout of the King's forces; then he discovers the body of his father.

Shame and Confusion all is on the rout,
Feare frames disorder, and disorder wounds
Where it should guard. O Warre, thou sonne of hell,
Whom angry heauens do make their minister,
Throw in the frozen bosomes of our part,
Hot Coales of Vengeance. Let no Souldier flye.
He that is truly dedicate to Warre,
Hath no selfe-loue: nor he that loues himselfe,
Hath not essentially, but by circumstance
The name of Valour. O let the vile world end,
And the premised Flames of the Last day,
Knit earth and heauen together.
Now let the generall Trumpet blow his blast,
Particularities, and pettie sounds
To cease. Was't thou ordain'd (deere Father)
To loose thy youth in peace, and to atcheue
The Siluer Liurey of aduised Age,
And in thy Reuerence, and thy Chaire-dayes, thus
To die in Ruffian battell? Euen at this sight,
My heart is turn'd to stone: and while 'tis mine,
It shall be stony. Yorke, not our old men spares:
No more will I their Babes, Teares Virginall,

Shall be to me, euen as the Dew to Fire,
 And Beautie, that the Tyrant oft reclaimes,
 Shall to my flaming wrath, be Oyle and Flax:
 Henceforth, I will not haue to do with pittie.
 Meet I an infant of the house of Yorke,
 Into as many gobbits will I cut it
 As wilde *Medea* yong *Absirtis* did.
 In cruelty, will I seeke out my Fame.
 Come thou new ruine of olde Cliffords house:
 As did *Æneas* old *Anchyses* beare,
 So beare I thee vpon my manly shoulders:
 But then, *Æneas* bare a liuing load;
 Nothing so heauy as these woes of mine. (ll. 31-65)

With this we may compare the Quarto:

Yoong Clifford. Father of Comberland,
 Where may I seeke my aged father forth?
 O! dismall sight, see where he breathlesse lies,
 All smeard and weltred in his luke-warme blood,
 Ah, aged pillar of all Comberlands true house,
 Sweete father, to thy murthred ghoast I sweare,
 Immortall hate vnto the house of Yorke,
 Nor neuer shall I sleepe secure one night,
 Till I haue furiously reuengde thy death,
 And left not one of them to breath on earth.

He takes him vp on his backe.

And thus as old Ankyses sonne did beare
 His aged father on his manly backe,
 And fought with him against the bloodie Greeks,
 Euen so will I. But staie, heres one of them,
 To whom my soule hath sworne immortall hate. (ll. 43-57)

That faulty memory, cutting, or adaptation can account for the variations between these two passages is exceedingly doubtful. If we consider the Folio passage in the light of our previous discussion, we may first observe a recurrent phenomenon. The first nine and one-half lines tell the audience that King Henry's army has

been routed, and by sheer poetic intensity evoke violent emotion. The compactness of the thought is mirrored in both rhythm and imagery. The two statements of the first line are followed by a taut metaphorical personification that runs a line and a half. Then follows the appeal to War with another striking image followed by the short, "Let no Souldier flye." The cause of the rout, fear or self-love, is analyzed with amazing brevity and amazing strength.

We have seen before this use in the Folio of a passage of poetic emotion to emphasize a dramatic situation, as in King Henry's figurative farewell to Gloucester, in Gloucester's analysis of the future, in York's two soliloquies, and in Queen Margaret's description of Gloucester and the state. All of these have a subtle dramatic function and it is that function, together with the concomitant poetic achievement, which is lacking in the Quarto.

Secondly, we can observe the structural development of these lines which by their compactness are linked in pregnant utterance. Fear is the cause of the rout, and out of it comes disorderly flight which, though designed to save the fleeing soldiers, does in fact make them an easy prey. Could fear be stopped and replaced by a desire for vengeance, then might the rout cease. But there is little hope of this because the true soldier, dedicated to war, is selfless and knows not fear. Those who think of themselves can be called valorous only because of the mere circumstance of being in battle. In other words, such men will turn and fly and the rout cannot be ended. All this is contained in a well-constructed verse paragraph.

Such organic unity is again apparent in Clifford's reaction to the discovery of his father's body. His grief finds outlet in his powerful cry for the Day of Judgment. Two ideas, each expressed in but two and one-half lines, evoke a striking image of the world's end: earth and heaven knit together in flame and the last—how much better is Shakespeare's adjective, "general"—trumpet silencing the petty clamor of the world.

From this first despair, Clifford's grief softens as he thinks of his dead father in personal terms: the old man, whose last years should have been peaceful, has been slain in battle.

This unnatural death leads easily to the next idea, that of venge-

ance, with the sight of his dead father turning Clifford's heart to stone. The form of Clifford's vengeance is heavy with foreshadowing; there are two references to the slaughter of children and of course we think of Clifford's murder of young Rutland in 3 *Henry VI*. The first is one of the three illustrations of Clifford's stony heart, and the second is a direct statement in which he tells what he will do to any "infant of the house of Yorke." This final act of vengeance forcibly delineated is, of course, the climax, both in its present horror and its foreshadowing of the actual deed itself. The structural pattern seems clear.

The final section of the speech fittingly concludes the whole. Like Æneas he will bear his father, but unlike Æneas he carries not a living being but a heavy burden of woes: his dead father, his vengeance, and the knowledge of defeat. Although the Quarto does mention "Ankyses sonne," the felicitous turn of the figure is there lacking; there is no positive integration of figure and meaning.

In all respects this speech of Clifford's typifies the poetry which is unique in the Folio: the imagery is functional; it is not mere decoration; the rhythm runs on beyond the individual line to create a period of varied cadence; this rhythmic period may be a part or the whole of a marked verse paragraph; and, finally, the purpose of all these qualities is to emphasize a dramatic situation so that meaning is clarified for the audience. On the other hand, none of these qualities is found in the Quarto, where the unique poetry of that text has a noticeable end-stopping, a routine imagery, as in the description of the infernal regions (l.iv.31-7), no sense of organic verse structure, and, finally, no dramatic emphasis.

It has been manifestly impossible to discuss all instances of variation in style between the two texts, so I have sought to exemplify that style found in the Folio alone. Thus the reader may judge its quality and weigh the question of why no trace of this style or its dramatic function is found in the Quarto. As we proceed the reader will have further opportunities to observe passages which are in a general sense common to both texts, but where there are considerable stylistic variations and these too may be of interest in answering the question of the relationship of the texts.

Chapter 4. CHARACTER AND STRUCTURE

The variations between the two texts which affect characterization and alter the dramatic structure are well exemplified by I.iii. This is a scene which includes all the major characters and lays the foundation of subsequent action. Because of this extensive scope, there are here presented five different episodes: (1) the petitioners mistake Suffolk for Duke Humphrey, and both Suffolk and the Queen learn of the armorer's treason; (2) the Queen complains to Suffolk; (3) the King is faced with the problem of appointing a regent for France; (4) the Queen strikes Eleanor; and (5) Gloucester renders a decision on the treason of the armorer and the appointment of a regent. The Quarto presents these events in an order different from that in the Folio, so that the playing varies between the two texts. The first episode in both texts is that of the petitioners. In the Quarto we find the following stage direction:

Enter the Duke of *Suffolke* with the Queene, and they [the petitioners] take him for Duke *Humphrey*, and giues him their writings.

At once the first petitioner realizes the mistake; but the Queen, after inquiring with whom they would speak and hearing it to be the Duke of Gloucester, orders Suffolk to read the petitions. In order these are (1) a complaint against the Lord Cardinal's man; (2) a complaint by Peter that his master [Horner, the armorer] had said the Duke of York was true heir to the throne; and after Peter has been taken away (3) a complaint against Suffolk for enclosing the commons of Long Melford, to which, quite nat-

urally, Suffolk reacts violently by tearing up the petitions and exclaiming, "Dare these pesants write against me thus."

This episode is quite different in the Folio text. The stage direction reads, "*Enter Suffolke, and Queene.*" Peter approaches them, but even though he is warned by the second petitioner, Suffolk has noticed them and inquires, "would'st any thing with me?" After one admits that they mistook Suffolk for Gloucester, the Queen evidently takes the petitions, for she asks, "To my Lord Protector?" as though she were reading the inscription. The first petition is the same as in Q, against the Cardinal's man, but the second is that against Suffolk which is, according to the text, read by Suffolk. The Duke is far more restrained than in Q, for here his comment is, "How now, Sir Knave?" Peter's complaint against his master follows and the Queen resumes the position of interrogator; Suffolk merely summons a servant and places Peter in custody. The Queen in a final outburst against Gloucester tears the petitions.

The alteration of the order of the petitions and the fact that the Queen takes the lead are seemingly related. In Q Suffolk tears the petitions in angry retort to the complaint against him and then exclaims against the peasants. In F this complaint is not last but is second and Suffolk's reaction is relatively mild. Thus the scene in F ends with the Queen expressing her scorn of Gloucester in words and in the deed of tearing the papers.

Both texts can be played, but from the foregoing we observe a great shift in emphasis, with the Folio not only making the Queen the dominant figure instead of Suffolk but also uniting this episode with that which follows immediately. The Queen's hatred of Gloucester and his wife, Eleanor, is part of her ensuing dialogue with Suffolk. By emphasizing this fact in the petition episode and by providing a direct transition, the dramatist builds the whole scene in a way which the Quarto does not. In other words, the variations which we have noted point out that the dramatic emphasis and the characterization of the two texts are different.

The Queen

In the ensuing conversation between the Queen and Suffolk, following the episode of the petitioners, we find the same basic variations. It will be useful to examine these lines in some detail, and the relevant passages from both texts will be found in the Appendix. In *F* the Queen makes the following points: (1) she is Queen in name only, since Gloucester as Protector exercises the royal prerogative; (2) the King is bent to holiness, not to worldly power; (3) the Cardinal, Somerset, Buckingham, and York—all have more power than the King; (4) Eleanor, Duchess of Gloucester, lords it over the Court and has finer clothes than does the Queen. In reply, Suffolk answers each point in reverse order: (1) he has a plot under way which will destroy Eleanor; (2) they must for the sake of expediency join forces with the Cardinal until Gloucester has been put out of power; (3) York will lose power because of the business of the armorer; (4) the others will be weeded out one by one, and (5) the Queen shall ultimately “steere the happy Helme.”

The same passage in *Q* is handled quite differently. In order, the Queen (1) exclaims against Gloucester's popularity with the commons, (2) points out that the commons do not have a high regard for the King who spends his time reading books, (3) is indignant that Gloucester and his wife pay scant courtesy to her, and (4) laments that the King is not like Suffolk. The latter replies only that he will content the Queen and tells her he has plotted to ruin both Gloucester and his wife.

Thus there is no suggestion in the Quarto of the Queen's driving desire for power which is evident in the Folio. As we have already noted, the episode preceding, that of the petitioners, gave evidence of the Queen's forcefulness and her dominating personality. Where the Quarto made Suffolk the central figure, the Folio assigned that role to the Queen. This strong will to power endows the character with a motivation which is quite lacking in the other text, and this aspect of the Queen is emphasized both in *2 Henry VI* and in the subsequent plays of the tetralogy. She thus achieves a stature somewhat higher than that of the woman jealous of social

position. She wishes to rule, and when finally thwarted she becomes the virago prophesying doom in *Richard III*.

But in the scene at hand there is further evidence of the Folio's characterization of Queen Margaret. The Folio contains an attack on Gloucester by the Cardinal and others which leads to the Duke's departure from the stage. The charges hurled at Gloucester are many, one of the most damaging being that of the Queen:

Thy sale of Offices and Townes in France,
If they were knowne, as the suspect is great,
Would make thee quickly hop without thy Head. (ll. 138-40)

At this Humphrey leaves, being overwhelmed by such an accusation of treason coupled with veniality. That the Queen has these lines in the Folio with no counterpart in the Quarto seems to show that the author of the Folio is interested in presenting various facets of the Queen's desire for power. She will even make the most grievous charge against good Duke Humphrey.

This enmity to Gloucester as the chief barrier between the Queen and power is again strengthened in the Folio text of III.i. Here Margaret has several passages which have no counterpart in Q and though some of these have already been discussed in connection with the problem of imagery, we may now examine these and the others in light of the present subject. Taking her cue from the King's observation that Gloucester has not arrived for the Parliament, the Queen presents her view of Gloucester.

Queene. Can you not see? or will ye not obserue
The strangenesse of his alter'd Countenance?
With what a Maiestie he beares himselfe,
How insolent of late he is become,
How prowde, how peremptorie, and vnlike himselfe.
We know the time since he was milde and affable,
And if we did but glance a farre-off Looke,
Immediately he was vpon his Knee,
That all the Court admir'd him for submission.
But meet him now, and be it in the Morne,
When euery one will giue the time of day,

He knits his Brow, and shewes an angry Eye,
 And passeth by with stiffe vnbowed Knee,
 Disdaining dutie that to vs belongs.
 Small Curres are not regarded when they grynne,
 But great men tremble when the Lyon rores,
 And *Humfrey* is no little Man in England.
 First note, that he is neere you in discent,
 And should you fall, he is the next will mount.
 Me seemeth then, it is no Pollicie,
 Respecting what a rancorous minde he beares,
 And his aduantage following your decease,
 That he should come about your Royall Person,
 Or be admitted to your Highnesse Councell.
 By flatterie hath he wonne the Commons hearts:
 And when he please to make Commotion,
 'Tis to be fear'd they all will follow him.
 Now 'tis the Spring, and Weeds are shallow-rooted,
 Suffer them now, and they'le o're-grow the Garden,
 And choake the Herbes for want of Husbandry.
 The reuerent care I beare vnto my Lord,
 Made me collect these dangers in the Duke.
 If it be fond, call it a Womans feare:
 Which feare, if better Reasons can supplant,
 I will subscribe, and say I wrong'd the Duke.
 My Lord of Suffolke, Buckingham, and Yorke,
 Reproue my allegation, if you can,
 Or else conclude my words effectuell. (ll. 4-41)

Part of what she says also appears in the Quarto and that passage will be found in the Appendix, but our concern is with the material unique in the Folio. Lines 5-8 (not in Q) reveal at once her motivation and her intent. Gloucester affects "majesty" and exhibits certain unfortunate symptoms of that state: he is insolent, proud, and peremptory—all characteristics which the royal Margaret well demonstrates herself. Gloucester, in the Queen's eyes, has the power which is thereby denied her, therefore he must be eliminated and the means are at hand. This affected majesty has

one obvious explanation; Gloucester desires the throne for himself. As the Queen points out (l. 21) Gloucester is heir apparent and it should be obvious to the King that the near presence of such a rancorous mind could easily bring about his own decease.

Now this charge that Gloucester may become king is used by the conspirators as the chief reason for his necessary death, but that it is false the audience knows from the evidence of I.ii. There the Duchess recounted her dream wherein she was crowned in Westminster Abbey by Henry and Margaret, and Gloucester's denunciation was both forceful and immediate. He is innocent of any such intent as his enemies charge, and the falsity of their charge is a clear indication of their own intentions. When the Queen (ll. 21-35), with apparently the most high-minded motive—reverent care for her lord—attempts to plant such thoughts in the King's mind, her character is very clear to the audience: her selfish love of power leads her to the means of a Machiavel.

Much the same type of thing is found in the presentation of the Queen's love for Suffolk. As we have noted, the business of Suffolk's head and the Queen's words addressed to this object do not appear in Q. In fact this scene in Q has been noted as being very different from that in F. The Queen has but one line in Q as opposed to 11 in F of which 10 are devoted to the Duke of Suffolk and her love for him. The Folio's emphasis on their relationship further blackens the character of the "blood-bespotted Neapolitan." For example, the conclusion of III.ii records the farewell of the two lovers and the Folio alone contains, among other lines, the following passages:

Qu. Oh, let me intreat thee cease, giue me thy hand,
That I may dew it with my mournfull teares:
Nor let the raine of heauen wet this place,
To wash away my wofull Monuments. (ll. 339-42)

. ; .

Suf. . . .
'Tis not the Land I care for, wer't thou thence,
A Wildernesse is populous enough,
So Suffolke had thy heauenly company:

For where thou art, there is the Worlde it selfe,
 With euery seuerall pleasure in the World:
 And where thou art not, Desolation. (ll. 359-64)

When we reflect that here speak England's Queen and one of the peers of the realm, the situation paints them both in the blackest colors; the more fervent and vivid their words, the more repulsive their sin. Dramatic effectiveness is enhanced as the audience is shocked, a fact better revealed in the Folio than in the Quarto.

The King

During her dialogue with Suffolk (I.iii) Queen Margaret described the King in some detail and this passage calls attention to another aspect of the Folio text—its characterization of the King.

But all his minde is bent to Holinesse,
 To number *Aue-Maries* on his Beades:
 His Champions, are the Prophets and Apostles,
 His Weapons, holy Sawes of sacred Writ,
 His Studie is his Tilt-yard, and his Loues
 Are brazen Images of Canonized Saints.
 I would the Colledge of the Cardinalls
 Would chuse him Pope, and carry him to Rome,
 And set the Triple Crowne vpon his Head;
 That were a State fit for his Holinesse. (ll. 58-67)

The only reference to the King's behavior in Q are the two lines:

Whose eyes are alwaies poring on his booke,
 And nere regards the honour of his name, . . . (ll. 47-8)

Whereas Margaret in Q is content to condemn her husband for bookishness, the Folio emphasizes his holiness, his concern for things spiritual with consequent disregard for things temporal; and the antithetical figures of champions—apostles, weapons—saws, and study—tilt-yard are most effective in thus delineating the King.

Already we have noted, in the chapter on variations in playing,

a contrast between the King of Q and the King of F; but it will be well to assemble the relevant material. Throughout there are many short passages in F where the King's piety is revealed by his own words. As Gloucester and the Cardinal quarrel at the beginning of II.i, the King hears a reference to heaven, so he interjects, "The Treasurie of euerlasting Ioy." The Simpcox episode in the same scene reveals more of these pious ejaculations, as for example, the King's reaction to news of the supposed miracle:

Now God be prays'd, that to beleeuing Soules
Giues Light in Darknesse, Comfort in Despaire. (ll. 66-7)

As Simpcox draws near, the King observes:

Great is his comfort in this Earthly Vale,
Although by his sight his sinne be multiplyed. (ll. 70-1)

After Simpcox has answered a question concerning the place of his birth, the King advises:

Poore Soule,
Gods goodnesse hath beene great to thee:
Let neuer Day nor Night vnhalloved passe,
But still remember what the Lord hath done. (ll. 84-7)

When Simpcox is exposed, the King is shocked and appeals to heaven.

O God, seest thou this, and bearest so long? (l. 154)

The false miracle is followed by news of the Duchess and the conjurers, after which the scene ends with the King making the appropriate closing remarks. There are, however, interesting variations between the two texts even in such a routine matter. First the Quarto—

King Come my Lords this night wee le lodge in S. Albones,
And tomorrow we will ride to London,
And trie the vtmost of these Treasons forth,
Come vnckle Gloster along with vs,
My mind doth tell me thou art innocent. (ll. 166-70)

The Folio:

King Well, for this Night we will repose vs here:
 To morrow toward London, back againe,
 To looke into this Businesse thorowly,
 And call these foule Offendors to their Answeres;
 And poyse the Cause in Iustice equall Scales,
 Whose Beame stands sure, whose rightful cause preuailles.
 (ll. 200-5)

The King's naïve idealism is lacking in the Quarto, that has the wise observation about Gloucester's innocence which, in turn, is lacking in the Folio. The contrast between the two views of the King seems evident.

Gloucester's fate is dealt with at length by the King in III.i of the Folio, a passage we have already discussed in relation to the subject of imagery. It will also be remembered that this passage, together with the figure of the calf taken to slaughter, had dramatic relevance in focusing attention on a turning point of the play. Now we may perhaps see a third feature, the dramatic exposition of the unworldly nature of the King unable to cope with the machinations of those who surround him.

Seldom if ever does the King of the Folio exhibit resolution or decision; always he submits to the will of others, and so we understand the significance of his many pious aphorisms and his Queen's suggestion that he be made Pope of Rome. That the King is aware of his own nature is somewhat pathetically pointed in the Folio when Warwick invites him to view the corpse of Gloucester:

Warw. Come hither gracious Soueraigne, view this body.
King. That is to see how deepe my graue is made,
 For with his soule fled all my worldly solace:
 For seeing him, I see my life in death. (ll. 149-52)

But even though the King realizes what lies ahead, his faith remains undaunted as we may observe in his remark, again unique in the Folio, following the quarrel that breaks out over Gloucester's death.

King. What stronger Brest-plate then a heart vntainted?
 Thrice is he arm'd, that hath his Quarrell iust;
 And he but naked, though lockt vp in Steele,
 Whose Conscience with Iniustice is corrupted. (ll. 232-5)

Such a breastplate is of no avail to a king who shrinks from decision. Perhaps the only decision Henry does make is to banish Suffolk but, according to the Folio, he is not even on this occasion acting independently. In reply to the commons' demand for Suffolk's exile, the King instructs Salisbury:

Goe *Salisbury*, and tell them all from me,
 I thanke them for their tender louing care;
 And had I not beene cited so by them,
 Yet did I purpose as they doe entreat:
 For sure, my thoughts doe hourelly prophecie,
 Mischance vnto my State by *Suffolkes* meanes.
 And therefore by his Maiestie I sweare,
 Whose farre-vnworthie Deputie I am,
 He shall not breathe infection in this ayre,
 But three dayes longer, on the paine of death. (ll. 279-88)

If we examine this a bit closely we see that the cause for action is the threat to Henry's state as God's deputy on earth, not any threat to Henry as a man. Therefore he swears not by himself but by God's Majesty that Suffolk shall be exiled. There is no suggestion of this idea in the Quarto, which reads:

Good Salsbury go backe againe to them,
 Tell them we thanke them all for their louing care,
 And had I not bene cited thus by their meanes,
 My selfe had done it. Therefore here I sweare,
 If Suffolke be found to breathe in any place,
 Where I haue rule, but three daies more, he dies. (ll. 131-6)

The King's piety is strongly emphasized by the Folio in even such a brief scene as that of the Cardinal's death (III.iii). The following lines have no counterpart in Q:

Ah, what a signe it is of euill life,
Where death's approach is seene so terrible. (ll. 5-6)

O thou eternall mouer of the heauens,
Looke with a gentle eye vpon this Wretch,
Oh beate away the busie medling Fiend,
That layes strong siege vnto this wretches soule,
And from his bosome purge this blacke dispaire. (ll. 19-23)

Peace to his soule, if Gods good pleasure be. (l. 26)

Again in IV.iv the Folio, in contrast with the Quarto, presents the King as unworldly, impractical, and indecisive. It will be remembered that Buckingham, who is present only in F, decides that the King should retire to Killingworth. In the opening of the scene Buckingham inquires the nature of the King's response to Cade and the rebels, and he is told, in lines unique in F:

Ile send some holy Bishop to intreat:
For God forbid, so many simple soules
Should perish by the Sword. And I my selfe,
Rather then bloody Warre shall cut them short,
Will parley with *lacke Cade* their Generall.
But stay, Ile read it ouer once againe. (ll. 9-14)

Hearing from the messenger of the rebels' excesses the King in F exclaims:

O gracelesse men! they know not what they do. (l. 38)

As he departs for Killingworth King Henry says:

Come *Margaret*, God, our hope, will succor us. (l. 56)

In the Quarto, the King reacts quite differently to the messenger's report; he at once issues instructions:

Go bid Buckingham and Clifford, gather
An Army vp, and meete with the Rebels.
Come Madame, let vs haste to Killingworth. (ll. 18-20)

Again in IV.ix the Folio offers further evidence of the pious, impractical King. Nothing could be more specific than Henry's opening lines:

Was euer King that ioi'd an earthly Throne,
 And could command no more content then I?
 No sooner was I crept out of my Cradle,
 But I was made a King, at nine months olde.
 Was neuer Subiect long'd to be a King,
 As I do long and wish to be a Subiect. (ll. 1-6)

We have already noted that the conclusion of this scene, the news of York's return from Ireland, does not appear in Q and we can now examine the lines which follow the messenger's announcement.

King. Thus stands my state, 'twixt Cade and Yorke distrest,
 Like to a Ship, that hauing scap'd a Tempest,
 Is straight way calme, and boorded with a Pyrate.
 But now is Cade driuen backe, his men dispiere'd,
 And now is Yorke in Armes, to second him.
 I pray thee Buckingham go and meete him,
 And aske him what's the reason of these Armes:
 Tell him, Ile send Duke *Edmund* to the Tower,
 And *Somerset* we will commit thee thither,
 Vntill his Army be dismist from him.

Somerset. My Lord,
 Ile yeelde my selfe to prison willingly,
 Or vnto death, to do my Countrey good.

King. In any case, be not to rough in termes,
 For he is fierce, and cannot brooke hard Language.

Buc. I will my Lord, and doubt not so to deale,
 As all things shall redound vnto your good.

King. Come wife, let's in, and learne to gouern better,
 For yet may England curse my wretched raigne. (ll. 31-49)

The ship figure is most apt; King Henry is at the mercy of every storm and every pirate who would rob him. Instead of taking vigorous action against York, he urges Buckingham to speak gently to one who has taken up arms against him, and in his own words he calls his reign "wretched."

Even in defeat (V.ii) the King in the Quarto has some plan, some hope of recouping his losses.

Queene. Away my Lord, and flie to London straight,
Make hast, for vengeance comes along with them,
Come stand not to expostulate, lets go.

King. Come then faire Queene, to London let vs hast,
And sommon a Parlament with speede,
To stop the fury of these dyre euent. (ll. 62-7)

The Folio has a different King and Queen:

Qu. Away my Lord, you are slow, for shame away.

King. Can we outrun the Heauens? Good *Margaret* stay.

Qu. What are you made of? You'l nor fight nor fly:
Now is it manhood, wisdom, and defence,
To giue the enemy way, and to secure vs
By what we can, which can no more but flye.

Alarum a farre off.

If you be tane, we then should see the bottome
Of all our Fortunes: but if we haply scape,
(As well we may, if not through your neglect)
We shall to London get, where you are lou'd,
And where this breach now in our Fortunes made
May readily be stopt. (ll. 72-83)

In these few lines the Folio epitomizes the evidence we have observed concerning both the King and Queen. He is helpless and obviously resigned to God's will—Can we outrun the heavens?—while she is the driving force, the woman who will be Queen in spite of all. Why the Folio has altered these two characters has been suggested in the foregoing and by the text itself; but the change is better understood if we proceed to a related problem—the dramatic structure.

Structure

The scene with which we began this chapter (I.iii) contains an interesting variation in playing which is closely linked with the question of the structure of the Folio. In both texts there is the episode wherein Queen Margaret boxes the Duchess of Gloucester's ears. Now it is manifest that Gloucester cannot be a witness

to this, because he would become involved in the quarrel. Both texts have him leave the stage, but the manner of his doing so is the difference. In Q the dialogue between the Queen and Suffolk is followed by the dispute over the regentship in France which leads, in turn, to the charge of treason against York, one of the candidates. The armorer, Horner, who is reported to have said that York was the lawful heir to the throne, is brought in and denies the charge of his apprentice, Peter. Gloucester, at the King's request, pronounces a judgment that the two shall meet in single combat to decide the truth of the matter. Then, for no apparent reason, Gloucester exits and the ear boxing takes place with Eleanor leaving the stage in great anger. As unexplainedly as he departed, the Duke returns and renders a decision on the regentship in favor of Somerset, since the matter of the armorer has raised a possible question as to the Duke of York.

The Folio, on the other hand, has Gloucester leave the stage as a direct result of an attack made on him by Suffolk, the Cardinal, Somerset, Buckingham, and the Queen. As in Q the dispute about the regentship follows the Queen's dialogue with Suffolk; but instead of following this matter and the charge of treason, the Folio introduces the general attack on Gloucester, which leads to his departure. The ear boxing occurs at this point and Gloucester returns, explaining:

Now Lords, my Choller being ouer-blowne,
With walking once about the Quadrangle,
I come to talke of Common-wealth Affayres. (ll. 155-7)

He tells the King that York should be regent; quarreling between the nobles results, and Suffolk produces the armorer and his apprentice. In a double judgment, Gloucester gives the regentship to Somerset, because of possible suspicion against York, and proposes a trial by combat for Horner and his apprentice.

There are several interesting points in the Folio text, but the most important is the attack on Gloucester which does not exist in the Quarto. As we have seen, this provides a reason for Gloucester's leaving the stage, but this is only a part of the story. Until the time of Gloucester's murder, the Folio emphasizes, as the Quarto does

not, the opposition of all the factions at Court to the good Duke Humphrey. With Gloucester gone, the internecine struggle breaks forth and it will not cease. As we have seen, the dramatic significance of Gloucester's loss is clearly stated in the Folio by King Henry's extended figure of the calf led to slaughter. We can now turn to other evidence in F designed to build up to that moment.

For example, in the first scene of the play the Cardinal and Gloucester quarrel and the latter leaves the stage. In both texts the Cardinal attacks his departed enemy but the Folio contains the following unique lines:

Nay more, an enemy vnto you all,
 And no great friend, I feare me to the King;
 Consider Lords, he is the next of blood,
 And heyre apparant to the English Crowne:
 Had *Henrie* got an Empire by his marriage,
 And all the wealthy Kingdomes of the West,
 There's reason he should be displeas'd at it:
 Looke to it Lords, let not his smoothing words
 Bewitch your hearts, be wise and circumspect. (ll. 149-57)

As we have seen, this charge that Gloucester may eliminate Henry in order to gain the throne for himself is repeated by the Queen in III.i, again in lines found only in F. But the only appearance of it in Q is found when the Queen, Suffolk, York, and the Cardinal plot Gloucester's murder (III.i.117-18). The Folio also contains this reference, but in much more elaborate form.

The attack on Gloucester in I.iii seems to be a part of the Folio's emphasis on the universal enmity to the Duke. The charges made in this episode are explicit and complete. Suffolk begins with these points: under Gloucester's protectorship the commonwealth has been ruined, the French prevail, and the peers are no better than bondmen. The Cardinal continues with further grievances: the commons have been racked and the clergy robbed. Nor is Gloucester's private life spared; according to Somerset he has used public funds to build sumptuous residences for himself and to buy extravagant clothes for his wife. Buckingham adds that he has been excessively cruel in punishing malefactors, while, as we have noted,

the Queen culminates the account by accusing him of having sold towns and offices in France. All of this the King hears and yet he says nothing.

The culmination of the opposition occurs in III.i, where again the Folio contains material not found in the Quarto, and a large part of this is devoted to charges against Gloucester. We have already discussed the Queen's long speech at the beginning of the scene. Her warning against Gloucester is followed by a speech of Suffolk's in both texts, but only in the Folio does it contain these lines:

The Duchesse, by his subornation,
Vpon my Life began her diuellish practises:
Or if he were not priuie to those Faults,
Yet by reputing of his high discent,
As next the King, he was successiue Heire,
And such high vaunts of his Nobilitie,
Did instigate the Bedlam braine-sick Duchesse,
By wicked meanes to frame our Soueraignes fall. (ll. 45-55)

At this point the two texts vary markedly; Q has Somerset enter with the information that France is entirely lost; but F has a further attack on Gloucester before Somerset's entry. The Cardinal repeats the charge originally made by Buckingham in I.iii, that of cruel and unusual punishments, while York adds a new accusation: Gloucester has devoted to his own use taxes levied to pay the soldiers in France. The Queen ends this section with prophetic words:

. . . the welfare of vs all,
Hangs on the cutting short that fraudfull man. (ll. 80-1)

Shortly after Somerset's report, Gloucester enters only to be arrested by Suffolk on a charge of high treason. Although there are variations, both texts have York accuse Gloucester of taking bribes, stealing the soldiers' pay, and devising cruel and unusual punishments. Thus in the Folio there is a repetition; first the Queen, Suffolk, the Cardinal, and York warn the King against Gloucester, and then two of the charges they have made are re-

peated by York. It would seem that here we may have an example of hasty revision, but the important thing is the manner in which the Folio text has built up the case against Gloucester. Beginning with the Queen, each of his enemies adds to the charges and we are reminded of I.iii, where the same type of thing was found in F. Dramatically, these accusations delivered by each of Gloucester's enemies in turn are effective and structurally they emphasize the theme of the first half of the play, the elimination of Gloucester by factions who are unified only by their common enemy. The audience is made to understand the strength of the opposition, and Gloucester's arrest and subsequent murder are, in the Folio, the logical culmination of events. In the Quarto, on the other hand, where there are no specific accusations until after the arrest, that event seems to occur in arbitrary fashion. In other words, the Folio reveals definite evidence of an attention to dramatic structure which is lacking in the Quarto.

Chapter 5. MEMORIAL RECONSTRUCTION

HAVING examined the evidence found by a comparison of the two texts, we may wonder how it is explained or accounted for by the theory of memorial reconstruction. It is not unreasonable to expect that any theory of the relationship between the texts will recognize the problems raised by the variations in playing, the style, and the emphasis on character and structure. We are, after all, dealing with an important problem, since it involves the question of Shakespeare's early dramatic composition. Every piece of evidence should be subject to the most careful and objective scrutiny in the hope of finding the facts of the case insofar as they may be ascertained. Only thus can we hope to proceed on a rational basis.

Peter Alexander

If we now turn to discussions of the play based on the theory of memorial reconstruction, we find that a number of the variations we have noted are not discussed or are dealt with only in the most general terms. The first proponent of the theory, Peter Alexander, based his view principally on one scene, saying

There can be no question fortunately about the nature of important parts of the Quarto texts. The dialogue of *The Contention* reveals the hand of the pirate in one of the indispensable scenes in the play. In 2 *Henry VI*, Act II, sc. ii, the dramatist presents York's pretext for claiming the crown from the Lancastrian king. This is necessary to make clear the details of the Wars of the Roses; and the Duke's speech which sets forth his claim that he is nearer in descent to Edward III. than Henry, and so has a better right to the throne, is the key

to the rest of the drama. Shakespeare treats the question with the precision of the chroniclers. To see how limpingly the Quarto writer halts after Shakespeare one has only to compare the two versions in which this necessary question is considered.¹

Let us consider first the Quarto.

Enter the Duke of *Yorke*, and the Earles of/*Salsbury* and *Warwicke*.

Yorke. My Lords our simple supper ended, thus,
Let me reueale vnto your honours here,
The right and title of the house of *Yorke*,
To Englands Crowne by liniall desent.

War. Then *Yorke* begin, and if thy claime be good,
The Neuils are thy subiects to command.

Yorke. Then thus my Lords.
Edward the third had seuen sonnes,
The first was Edward the blacke Prince,
Prince of Wales.
The second was Edmund of Langly,
Duke of *Yorke*.
The third was Lyonell Duke of Clarence.
The fourth was Iohn of Gaunt,
The Duke of Lancaster.
The fifth was Roger Mortemor, Earle of March.
The sixt was sir Thomas of Woodstocke.
William of Winsore was the seuenth and last.

Now, Edward the blacke Prince he died before his father,
and left/behinde him Richard, that afterwards was King,
Crownde by/the name of Richard the second, and he died
without an heire./Edmund of Langly Duke of *Yorke* died,
and left behind him two/daughters, Anne and Elinor./Lyonell
Duke of Clarence died, and left behinde Alice, Anne,/and
Elinor, that was after married to my father, and by her I/
claime the Crowne, as the true heire to Lyonell Duke/of

1. *Shakespeare's Henry VI and Richard III*, p. 55.

Clarence, the third sonne to Edward the third. Now sir. In the/time of Richards raigne, Henry of Bullingbrooke, sonne and heire/to Iohn of Gaunt, the Duke of Lancanster fourth sonne to Edward/the third, he claime the Crowne, deposde the Merthfull King, and/as both you know, in Pomphret Castle harmelesse Richard was/shamefully murthered, and so by Richards death came the house of/Lancaster vnto the Crowne./

Sals. Sauing your tale my Lord, as I haue heard, in the raigne/of Bullenbrooke, the Duke of Yorke did claime the Crowne, and/but for Owin Glendor, had bene King./

Yorke. True. But so it fortun'd then, by meanes of that mon-/strous rebel Glendor, the noble Duke of York was done to death,/and so euer since the heires of Iohn of Gaunt haue possessed the/Crowne. But if the issue of the elder should succeed before the is-/sue of the yonger, then am I lawfull heire vnto the kingdome./

Warwicke. What plaine proceedings can be more plaine, hee/claimes it from Lyonel Duke of Clarence, the third sonne to Ed-/ward the third, and Henry from Iohn of Gaunt the fourth sonne./So that till Lyonels issue failes, his should not raigne. It failes not/yet, but florisheth in thee & in thy sons, braue slips of such a stock./Then noble father, kneele we both together, and in this priuate/place, be we the first to honor him with birthright to the Crown./

Both. Long liue Richard Englands royall King.

Yorke. I thanke you both. But Lords I am not your King, vntil/this sword be sheathed euen in the hart blood of the house of Lan-/caster

War. Then Yorke aduise thy selfe and take thy time,
 Claime thou the Crowne, and set thy standard vp,
 And in the same aduance the milke-white Rose,
 And then to gard it, will I rouse the Beare,
 Inuiron'd with ten thousand Ragged-staues
 To aide and helpe thee for to win thy right,
 Maugre the proudest Lord of Henries blood,
 That dares deny the right and claime of Yorke,

For why my minde presageth I shall liue

To see the noble Duke of Yorke to be a King.

Yorke. Thanks noble Warwicke, and Yorke doth hope to see,/The Earle of Warwicke liue, to be the greatest man in England,/but the King. Come lets goe. (ll. 1-65)

Exet omnes.

There are in this genealogical account certain errors, as Alexander points out. William of Hatfield not Edmund Langley was the second son of Edward III and Langley was the fifth, with Roger Mortemor having no place in the pedigree at this point. But it will be best to let Alexander continue.

We cannot say that the Quarto was written by a dramatist who had studied the chronicles, but who trusted to his memory when he came to composition and in his impatience confused the details: it is not merely the details that are incorrect; the argument in the Quarto taken as a whole has no point whatever. York had to prove that, although descended from the fifth son of Edward III, he was, because of his father's marriage with a descendant of the third son, more in the direct line of succession than the heirs of the fourth son. The Quarto writer by making him declare his ancestor the Duke of York to be second son to Edward III renders further argument superfluous; he had now no need to claim the throne through a daughter of the third son as he proceeds to do. When therefore we come to inquire where he found, with the other details of his information, the statements that the Duke of York had two daughters Anne and Eleanor, and that Lionel also had daughters called Anne and Eleanor, we need not search for any historical source: a glance at the Folio makes it clear that this repetition was prompted by a confused recollection that

Roger had issue Edmund, Anne and Eleanor.

All the hopeless confusion in the details of the pedigree and the mechanical repetition of phrases found in the Folio indicate that we have in the Quarto nothing more than someone's

attempt to reconstruct from memory one of Shakespeare's scenes.²

Thus upon the evidence of this one scene Alexander dismisses Q as a memorial reconstruction, but careful study of the Q text, particularly with reference to its historical source, demonstrates the opposite conclusion: Q cannot have been derived from F. With Q relegated to the limbo of piracy, scholars have not been concerned with study of its sources and have thus neglected the most telling proof that Q is not a derived text.

A. D. Richardson³ has recently completed a critical edition of *The First Part of the Contention* wherein he has examined the sources in considerable detail, and his conclusions rule out any possibility of Q being a text derived from F. Briefly, Richardson finds that Grafton was the main source of Q with some possible use made of Hall and *The Mirror for Magistrates*. He finds no evidence that the author of Q had ever consulted either of the first two editions of Holinshed. On the other hand, as was pointed out by McKerrow,⁴ and as is amply proved by Dover Wilson's notes to his edition of *2 Henry VI*, the Folio text demonstrably relies on Shakespeare's favorite and almost exclusive source for historical materials, the 1587 edition of Holinshed's *Chronicles*. Are we to assume that by some incredible chance a reporter forgot every line or passage that was derived from Holinshed and thus produced a text whose only sources were those which Richardson has ascertained? Both the improbability and illogicality of this are patent: revision by Shakespeare of an old play is the only means by which details from the 1587 Holinshed could have been grafted onto the basic historical material derived from the older chronicles.

If we examine the Quarto's text of the scene in question we will find further historical and certain bibliographical details which will

2. *Ibid.*, pp. 62-3.

3. A. D. Richardson, ed., *The First Part of the Contention*, a critical edition, Unpublished Yale dissertation. This will be printed by the Yale University Press at an early date.

4. R. B. McKerrow, "A Note on 'Henry VI, part II' and the Contention of York and Lancaster," *R. E. S.*, 9 (1933), 157 ff.

explain the nature of the corruption. Beginning with line 7 the length of line is noticeably short. York is speaking in prose, so the only possible explanation of the lineation is that the compositor was following his copy, and the line length was determined by what he read there. A likely explanation of such lineation is that these lines were written in the margin of a sheet which was already full. This type of thing would and did occur to a MS in the process of revision, as is demonstrated by the MS of *The Book of Sir Thomas More*. There we find lines written in the margin, interlineations, individual lines crossed through, small bits of paper pasted over the original, passages marked for deletion, and new material not clearly linked up with the old. Of the textual problems which would have arisen had this been used as printer's copy, Sir Walter Greg remarks succinctly, "If this manuscript . . . had been sent to press as it stands, some considerable confusion might have resulted in the printed text."⁵

And it is confusion of this type which explains the corruption of the Quarto text in this scene wherein York claims the throne. The short lines indicate marginal writing while the confusion that is found in the ensuing longer lines suggest interlineations or a scrap of paper pasted over the original. In either event the copy was far from clear and the errors seem to be the compositor's attempt to do what he could. Unlike the compositor of the Folio who could consult the printed text of Q when his own copy was bad,⁶ the Quarto compositor had no recourse but to untangle the problem according to his own deciphering of confused copy.

As instances of this I would cite the strange paternity of the three sisters "Alice, Anne, and Eleanor." If on the evidence of the sources that Q cannot be derived from F, we seek an explanation, we may find it by consulting Grafton and offering a hypothetical reconstruction of the copy used by the compositor of Q. Let us suppose that this copy read as follows:

5. *Two Elizabethan Stage Abridgments*, p. 250, n. 1. The MS of *Sir Thomas More* has recently been studied and well described by R. C. Bald in *Shakespeare Survey* (1949), 2, 44-65.

6. Such procedure is found in F according to both Madeleine Doran and McKerrow. See above, p. 22.

Lyonell Duke of Clarence died, and left behind
 one only daughter, named Phillip, who was
 married to Edmund Mortimer earle of March
 who left behind Roger Mortemor, Earle of March.
 Roger Mortemor, Earle of March died and left behind
 Ales, Anne, and Elinor that was
 made a nunne, and Anne the eldest was
 after married to my father, and
 by her I claim the Crowne, as the true
 heire to Lyonell Duke of Clarence, the
 third sonne to Edward the third.

Such hypothetical copy based on Grafton⁷ suggests how "Lyonell Duke of Clarence" came to father the three daughters of Roger Mortemor. The compositor's eye dropped after setting the first line and catching the words "left behind" which he had just set, he proceeded with the proper names "Ales, Anne, and Elinor," eliminating the intervening lines, quite unaware of the omission. As it happens, such omissions are frequent in printed books of the period.⁸ In fact, the Folio of 2 *Henry VI* contains just such an omission in IV.i, where line 48, lacking in F, must be supplied from Q. Such a compositor's careless omission would also account for the elision of "Elinor that was" with "after married to my father."

We may also be tempted by the Folio to suggest an explanation for the other errors found in York's claim to the throne. In III.ii of the Folio Queen Margaret refers to herself as "Nell" (l. 26), Elianor (l. 79), Eleanor (l. 100) and Eleanor (l. 120). On the basis of these examples we might suggest that the errors of the pedigree are merely careless slips, similar to many found in the writings of Shakespeare and his contemporaries.⁹

7. Richard Grafton, *A Chronicle at large, and meere history of the affayres of England* (1569), p. 347.

8. Sir Edmund Chambers lists this phenomenon as one of the chief causes of compositors' errors and cites examples from *Troilus and Cressida*, *Othello*, and *King Lear* (*William Shakespeare*, 1, 179-80).

9. Cf. *Love's Labour's Lost*, II.i-IV.ii and V.i; *King John*, II.i; Peele's *Edward 1*, *passim*.

There is one other bit of evidence which demonstrates conclusively that the Folio text is not the source of the scene at hand. The Folio tells us that Roger, Earl of March, had issue Edmund, Anne, and Eleanor. It makes no mention of Alice. The reason for this omission is clear: Shakespeare is here using as his source "The Articles betwixt king Henrie and the duke of Yorke," which was printed for the first time in the 1587 edition of Holinshed's *Chronicles* (III, 657-8), and here only the two daughters, Anne and Eleanor, are mentioned. On the other hand, Grafton (p. 347), who is the source for Q, tells us that the children of Roger were Edmund, Roger, Anne, Alice, and Eleanor. The name "Ales" in Q cannot derive from F since it does not appear in that text; it is found in Q because the author of that play found it in his source and incorporated it in the MS. Thus consultation of the respective sources of the two plays rules out the theory of memorial reconstruction, and it becomes inevitable that a compositor wrestling with faulty copy rather than a pirate wrestling with a faulty memory can be the only explanation for the errors in this scene of Q. Faulty memory may account for the omission of a name but it does not account for the addition of a historically correct name. The copy for the Quarto must have read something like the reconstruction that has been given, but either its condition was such that the compositor could not read it all or else he omitted the lines dealing with Phillip, Edmund, and Roger Mortemor.

The Quarto's naming of Anne and Elinor as the daughters of Edmund Langley, Duke of York, also appears to be a compositor's error. What the Quarto copy probably contained was something like the following:

Edmund of Langley Duke of Yorke
died and left behind him two
sons Edward of Norwich, Duke
of York, and Richard, Earl of
Cambridge, that was my father.

It is my suggestion that the reviser of Q decided to insert by interlineation York's pedigree. He therefore crossed out the lines dealing with the progeny of Clarence and Mortemor and wrote in the

lines given in my reconstruction. The compositor set correctly the beginning "Edmund Langley Duke of York died and left behind him two." He then picked up one of the old lines presumably marked for deletion, "daughters Anne and Elinor." With this apparently making sense, he turned to the next line he could make out, "Lyonell Duke of Clarence died and left behind." As we have seen he omitted, either through carelessness or because of illegible copy, the intervening lines and came up with the three daughters of Mortemor.

Similarly the Quarto's errors with regard to the second and fifth sons of Edward III may be explained as careless mistakes in the copy, like the Folio's confusion of Margaret and Elinor. These are not unusual errors, since we find them often in Shakespeare. The important thing at this point is that we have resolved the major crux of the scene, York's claim to the throne, through the descent from Lionel, Duke of Clarence, third son to Edward III.

Since we have been forced by the facts of the matter to reject the notion that this scene reveals "the hand of the pirate," we are also forced to reject Alexander's theory that the major part of the Quarto originated through the agency of memorial reconstruction. This scene was the only one which Alexander adduced as proof that a comparison of the texts revealed evidence for memorial reconstruction. A second scene (III.ii.300 ff.) is discussed by Alexander but his purpose here was to afford "an example of his [the actor playing Suffolk's part] reporting, and [to show] how superior the version of his own lines is to that which he can supply of the Queen's." As is clear, this constitutes no independent evidence for the existence of a reporter. Elsewhere Alexander points out certain scenes which have a close correspondence in the two texts. Such passages, he believed, were based on fragments of manuscripts in the possession of the reporters. On this hypothetical use of manuscript fragments, Sir Walter Greg remarked, "There are almost insuperable technical objections to this assumption into which I need not enter." Sir Edmund Chambers was of the same opinion, "I do not see any evidence for a fragmentary transcript or know why any such document should have come into existence." Madeleine Doran and R. B. McKerrow proposed the alternate

theory that the Folio compositor, faced with illegible copy, consulted the printed text of Q.

Sir Edmund Chambers

Sir Edmund Chambers originally believed in a theory of revision, but he was persuaded to change his mind by Alexander's work and Sir Walter Greg's study of *Orlando Furioso* and *The Merry Wives of Windsor*. Thus he accepts the hypothesis that Q is a memorial reconstruction, although he realizes the need for "some buttressing of the 'report' theory."¹⁰ It was, of course, impossible for Sir Edmund, within the scope of his work, to examine the problem in much detail.

The first buttress to be added is a second hypothesis, "The basis of Q must have been a production for which the original text had been cut."¹¹ What led Sir Edmund to this conclusion was his observation that a different staging is found in each text for I.iv and III.ii. It is difficult to understand how cutting can explain the variations in the playing of I.iv. In Q Eleanor enters with the conjurers and then "goes vp to the Tower." In F the conjurers enter alone and Eleanor enters "aloft." It may well be that Q represents the playing in a particular theater that had an unusual appurtenance called "the Tower" and that F represents a more conventional theater with a "tarras" or upper stage; but surely there is no evidence here of cutting. Q has 54 lines and F 84 but it should be remembered that at least 25 lines of F are occupied by York's reading the prophecies. Q does not omit these lines; it places them in II.i. Thus F really has only five more lines than Q. Nor does cutting explain why in Q we have an invocation to Night and in F a description of night as proper time for wizards' work; or why Bullenbroke in Q dispatches the Spirit with a description of the infernal regions in contrast with a two-line dismissal in F.

Sir Edmund takes cognizance of this last speech in Q by observing: ". . . some highly coloured Q lines in i, 4 of part 2 may have been removed when the staging of the scene was altered."¹² The

10. *William Shakespeare*, 1, 284.

11. *Ibid.*

12. *Ibid.*, p. 285.

only possible conclusion to which such a statement leads is that I.iv of F is a revision of the Quarto scene. As we have seen, however, Sir Edmund first said that the variation in the playing of this scene indicated that Q was an abridgment of F. Surely the evidence supports Sir Edmund's second explanation: the Quarto's description of the infernal regions and the nonappearance of this in F can best be explained as revision.

The second scene cited by Sir Edmund (III.ii) does indeed reveal cutting, but here again it is the Quarto which contains material not found in F. In other words the Folio is a cut version of Q. It will be remembered that Q shows us, on the inner stage, the murderers finishing with Gloucester. The Folio does not show this episode; instead we have only the stage direction, "*two or three running ouer the stage, from the Murther of Duke Humfrey.*" Once again the appearance in Q of material not found in F leads us inexorably to the only possible conclusion: F here represents revision of the Quarto text. Thus the two scenes noted by Sir Edmund instead of giving evidence that Q is a cut version of F prove quite the opposite and deny the original hypothesis, the existence of a reporter.

The second buttress erected by Sir Edmund in support of the report theory arises from the evidence of V.ii.31-65, Young Clifford's speech which we have discussed in connection with the style of the unique Folio material. Sir Edmund says that this passage is "clearly of later style than the rest" and adds "It is certainly Shakespearean."¹³ Let us think for a moment on the implications of Sir Edmund's remark. Sometime after having written *2 Henry VI*, Shakespeare rewrote one speech in V.ii. We must say "rewrote" for Q has a speech for Young Clifford at this point. What reason can we discover for this solitary example of revision? Why out of the whole play should Shakespeare choose this one speech for revision? Perhaps the actor playing the part of Clifford in a revival of *2 Henry VI* was a particular friend of Shakespeare's and asked him to provide a fine poetical speech. Perhaps Shakespeare in rereading his play decided that there was need for strengthening at this one point and nowhere else in the play.

13. *Ibid.*, p. 286.

Instead of speculating, we should look at the scene in which this revision took place. It will be remembered that the two texts are at considerable variance: the order of events differs; Q has stage business which either does not appear in F or is specifically denied by F; and there are lines in Q which do not appear in F. All these elements have been dealt with above and the reader may refresh his memory by consulting the appropriate sections of Act II and Act III. Several points, however, which have not been dealt with are raised by Sir Edmund's statement that Clifford's speech is later than the rest of the play. In Q Clifford's speech ends with the lines,

But staie, heres one of them,
To whom my soule hath sworne immortall hate. (ll. 56-7)

A stage direction follows.

Enter *Richard*, and then *Clifford* laies downe his father, fights with him, and *Richard* flies away againe.

Clifford's speech continues:

Out crooktbacke villaine, get thee from my sight,
But I will after thee, and once againe
When I haue borne my father to his Tent,
Ile trie my fortune better with thee yet. (ll. 58-61)

Exet young *Clifford* with his father.

If we accept Sir Edmund's view that the Folio represents Shakespeare's revision, it follows that Shakespeare deleted Clifford's fight with Richard. It seems reasonable to suppose that this episode existed in the text which Shakespeare rewrote, since we see from Q that the fight is integrated with Clifford's speech and with his action of carrying off his father's body. The only alternative is to assume that the pirate created the episode as well as the lines necessary to relate it to Clifford's speech. That Shakespeare deleted the encounter is, I believe, correct, and this deletion not only explains another variation between the two texts but suggests that Shakespeare did more to this scene than rewrite one speech.

For example, in the Folio Young Clifford leaves the stage carrying his father's body; Richard enters with Somerset and kills him

under the sign of an alehouse, the Castle, thus fulfilling the prophecy. In Q this encounter is the opening episode of the scene. If it is argued that the Quarto position is incorrect because of faulty memory, we must consider the implications. First Clifford would fight Richard, Richard would flee, Clifford would exit with the body, and Richard would immediately re-enter with Somerset. From every point of view this is not a very satisfactory sequence of events. At one moment Richard flees; the next, he kills an enemy. Much better is the Quarto order where the clash of arms is divided. For Richard to fight two opponents in succession is dramatically wasteful; spacing them out creates two episodes to excite the audience. In revision Shakespeare deleted the Clifford-Richard combat but wanting to present a scene of action to contrast with the reflections of Young Clifford he moved the Richard-Somerset fight from the beginning to this point.

A second feature of Shakespeare's revision is its foreshadowing of the murder of Rutland by Young Clifford in 3 *Henry VI*. In contrast with Q, which has Clifford swear immortal hate against all the house of York, F has the specific reference to an infant of that house cut into "gobbets." A similar type of "linking" is found in another unique aspect of F, but this time the link goes outside the *Henry VI* group. The name "Henry the Fifth" appears four times in F but no instance of it is found in Q. Madeleine Doran in commenting on this observes, "It is singular that all . . . references to him should be dropped inadvertently from the Quarto and more singular that they should be purposely omitted."¹⁴ There is no difficulty if we follow the implications of Young Clifford's speech; the references were added after *Henry V* had appeared as a successful and popular play.

There is still other evidence in this scene which can only mean that the Folio is a revision of the Quarto. We have already noted that Q contains material not found in F: (1) Old Clifford's reply to Warwick's challenge, spoken from "within," (2) the combat between Richard and Young Clifford, (3) the wounded Duke of Buckingham being carried to his tent, and (4) the lines with which the King concludes the scene. Further, the dialogue between Old

14. *Henry VI, Parts II and III*, p. 60.

Clifford and York contains ideas and references not found in the Folio. The Quarto reads:

Yorke. Now Clifford, since we are singled here alone,
Be this the day of doome to one of vs,
For now my heart hath sworne immortall hate
To thee and all the house of Lancaster.

Clifford. And here I stand, and pitch my foot to thine,
Vowing neuer to stir, till thou or I be slaine.
For neuer shall my heart be safe at rest,
Till I haue spoyle the hatefull house of Yorke.

Alarmes, and they fight, and *Yorke* kills *Clifford*.

Yorke. Now Lancaster sit sure, thy sinowes shrink,
Come fearefull Henry grouelling on thy face,
Yeeld vp thy Crowne vnto the Prince of Yorke. (ll. 32-42)
Exet Yorke.

The Folio:

Clif. What seest thou in me Yorke?
Why dost thou pause?

Yorke. With thy braue bearing should I be in loue,
But that thou art so fast mine enemye.

Clif. Nor should thy prowesse want praise & esteeme,
But that 'tis shewne ignobly, and in Treason.

Yorke. So let it helpe me now against thy sword,
As I in iustice, and true right expresse it.

Clif. My soule and bodie on the action both.

Yor. A dreadfull lay, addresse thee instantly.

Clif. *La fin Corrone les eumenes.*

Yor. Thus Warre hath giuen thee peace, for yⁿ art still,
Peace with his soule, heauen if it be thy will. (ll. 17-30)

The Folio does not mention the house of Lancaster nor does it contain any suggestion of York's last speech addressed to the absent King Henry. Also lacking is Clifford's reference to "the hatefull house of Yorke." Instead the Folio shows us two chivalric figures each with admiration for the other; they come before us

as human beings, not as puppets of two warring houses. The sophistication of the Folio is also apparent in the verse, and as we realize the great difference in conception and dramatic effectiveness of the two texts, we see still more reason to believe that Shakespeare not only rewrote one speech but that he reworked the entire scene.

Thus the evidence, which Sir Edmund found it necessary to explain on other grounds if the reporter theory was to be preserved, has led to a conclusion which denies the reporter theory completely. The three scenes in question demonstrate that the Folio is a revision of the Quarto and it is my belief that the variations discussed in Chapters 2, 3, and 4 prove that the entire play as found in F is a revision of Q.

Madeleine Doran

The most detailed study of the relationship between the two texts has been made by Madeleine Doran and her evidence, with her conclusions, needs to be considered. In the first place, Miss Doran deals with the corruptions of the Quarto text under the general headings of: (1) Corrupt Verse, (2) Nonsense Passages, (3) Anticipations and Recollections, (4) Transpositions, and (5) Omissions. The Corrupt Verse is of several types: (1) prose printed as verse, (2) mislineation, (3) hypermetrical lines, (4) verse fossils, and (5) verse printed as prose.¹⁵ She cites five examples from *The Contention* and concludes, "In default of any evident reason to believe in revision and because of many other reasons indicating reporting, the errors must in general be attributed to the latter cause." The reference to revision is not to the Folio being a revision but to the Quarto copy being a MS in which there were marginal insertions, interlineations, deletions, and additions written on slips of paper that were pasted over the original. In the discussion of II.ii (York's claim to the throne), it was suggested that just such copy gave rise to the errors of the Quarto at that point.

All our knowledge of dramatic publication emphasizes the fact that there was, with few exceptions, no preparation by the authors

15. *Ibid.*, pp. 10-27.

of copy for the printer. In contrast with nondramatic writing which was, by and large, seen through the press by the author, a play manuscript was overseen only by the printer, who did the best he could. And that this copy was often poor is proved by the considerable number of extant plays which are obviously corrupt. No such textual corruption is found in nondramatic works. To the Elizabethan, plays were not literature in the sense that the *Faerie Queene* was, and the only works with whose publication Shakespeare seems to have been connected were his two poems, *Venus and Adonis* and *The Rape of Lucrece*. The considerable amount of dramatic publication in 1594 is generally regarded as due to the financial difficulties of the companies. Evidently they sold their play-books to the printers and it is quite likely that these were not the best of copy. Even today the prompt copy of a play in actual production has interlineations, deletions, and marginal insertions of lines and business. Such copy would not make the compositor's task an easy one. Therefore, in view of the facts that we do possess, it is not an unwarranted assumption to say that a corruption is more reasonably explained by poor copy than by a theory of faulty memory.¹⁶

Several Folio plays contain a fair amount of corrupt verse: *Antony and Cleopatra* has extensive mislineation and a large number of misprints; *All's Well* not only contains mislineations but is in need of extensive emendation; *Coriolanus* abounds in mislineations; *Timon of Athens* reveals not only mislineation but the frequent

16. McKerrow makes it very clear ("The Elizabethan Printer and Dramatic Manuscripts," *R. E. S.*, 12 [1931-32], 253-75) that in many cases the copy used for dramatic texts was clearly inferior. He suggests an author's foul papers as an explanation. It seems to me that a heavily revised prompt-book might also be a source of corruption. I am aware of the argument that a company would be expected to keep its promptbooks because of the licensing approval inscribed in them. This is, however, opinion with no factual basis. An interesting problem is raised by the MS of *Edmond Ironside* (MS Egerton 1904). This is clearly a promptbook used in the 1630's, as is shown by the presence of actors' names. It is not autograph but is a scribe's copy, and the play itself clearly belongs to the 16th not the 17th century. I would suggest that we have here a copy written as a replacement for a worn out promptbook. There is no indication that either the original or this MS was licensed, yet it is certain that the play was acted. What disposition was made of the original, we do not know.

printing of prose as verse and verse as prose; and in *Two Gentlemen of Verona*, Sir Edmund Chambers observes “. . . the mingling of prose and verse, . . . the presence of blank verse rhythms in prose, . . . mentions of personages who do not appear.”¹⁷

In other words, corrupt verse per se is no evidence of memorial reconstruction. This fact becomes particularly evident when we realize that corrupt verse appears in the Folio whose editors, Heminge and Condell, are nowadays taken as specifically denouncing memorial reconstruction in their reference to “diuerse stolne, and surreptitious copies.” Certainly such scrupulous editors could not have condoned the inclusion of reporter’s work in plays which they guaranteed as being “absolute in their numbers, as he conceiued thẽ.” As a matter of fact, Sir Edmund Chambers, in discussing the corruption of *Timon* says, “It is very likely that there were frequent marginal insertions in the copy.”¹⁸ We have already seen, in connection with II.ii, that corruption there was explicable only on the grounds of poor copy containing marginal insertions, interlineations, and the like. Thus it appears reasonable to regard the corrupt verse of Q as everywhere arising from such a source.

Furthermore, the corrupt verse of Q is not any more extensive than that in some of the Folio plays which have been cited, and this points to a fact of considerable importance. The Quarto text is not per se a bad text: its sins are not those of commission, but of difference. Read as a play representative of those of the late 80’s or early 90’s it stands in its own right. It has far less mislineation than *The Spanish Tragedy* and its other faults shrink into nothingness when compared with such a play as Peele’s *Edward I*. In dramatic effectiveness the Quarto is superior to the Folio in the conjuring scene (I.iv), the King’s reading of the prophecies (II.i), and the murder of Gloucester (III.ii). It is by comparing the two texts that we perceive the over-all superiority of F, but our eagerness to believe that Shakespeare never revised thus closely the work of other men or of himself should not lead us to denigrate the Quarto on purely emotional grounds. We cannot, at least on ra-

17. *Op. cit.*, I, 329.

18. *Ibid.*, I, 481.

tional grounds, say that Q is a memorial reconstruction because it contains some corrupt verse.

The same judgment is applicable to Madeleine Doran's second category, "Nonsense Passages." The first of these is York's claim to the throne (II.ii), which is briefly discussed in the terms of Alexander. As we have seen, the Quarto here rests on different source materials than F and its errors are explicable on the ground of marginal and interlineated copy. The different source rules out memorial reconstruction and bad copy is the source of the errors.

Difficult copy is also the explanation of the second passage cited by Miss Doran. During the hawking at St. Albans (II.i) a quarrel breaks out between Gloucester and the Cardinal and the Quarto here lacks one line which, if supplied from F, renders the passage quite intelligible. The omission occurs in a speech by Gloucester which is given in Q as:

Humphrey. How now my Lord, why this is more then needs,
Church-men so hote. Good vnckle can you doate. (ll. 19-20)

The Folio reveals the omission.

Glost. What, Cardinall?

Is your Priest-hood growne peremptorie?

Tantæne animis Cælestibus irae, Church-men so hot?

Good Vnckle hide such mallice:

With such Holynesse can you doe it? (ll. 23-6)

Miss Doran is much concerned with the Quarto reading of "doate" for "do it," but, as Helge Kökeritz¹⁹ has shown, such phonetic spellings are quite common. All that is wrong with Q is that the compositor omitted

. . . hide such mallice:

With such Holynesse . . .

In other words, the compositor set "Good Vnckle" and omitted or could not read the next six words which may have been a single

19. *Shakespeare's Pronunciation* (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1953), p. 273.

line in his copy. As we have seen the Folio omits a line in IV.i, but as far as I know, no one has yet suggested that this is evidence for the memorial reconstruction of the Folio. Nor has any one considered the corrupt Folio verse found in the above speech by Gloucester as evidence of a reporter in that text. Not only is there mislineation; the scansion must be forced to realize an iambic pattern. Elsewhere throughout the Folio text are frequent mislineations, prose printed as verse, and verse as prose.

Miss Doran says that a compositor's error may be the cause of the omission, but she prefers the faulty memory of a reporter because of a subsequent variation between the texts. Following Gloucester's rebukeful question to the Cardinal, Suffolk breaks in and is answered by Gloucester. The Quarto reads:

Suffolke. Why not Hauing so good a quarrell & so bad a cause.

Humphrey. As how, my Lord?

Suffolke. As you, my Lord. And it like your Lordly Lords Protectorship. (ll. 21-4)

Miss Doran regards the first two lines as meaningless and nonsensical, but surely the passage is clear enough, if we will grant the omission by the Quarto compositor. Gloucester has inquired how the Cardinal can conceal such malice under the cloak of "Holynesse." Suffolk answers for the Cardinal: "Why should he not thus conceal malice, if his quarrel is just, and the cause thereof so bad?" Gloucester inquires quite naturally, "How can the cause be bad and the quarrel good?" Suffolk has a neat solution of the ambiguous antithesis, "You are the bad cause of the Cardinal's good quarrel with you."

Perhaps the reason for Miss Doran's inability to find any meaning in the Quarto may be found in the corresponding passage of F.

Suff. No mallice Sir, no more then well becomes
So good a Quarrell, and so bad a Peere.

Glost. As who, my Lord?

Suff. Why, as you, my Lord,
An't like your Lordly Lords Protectorship. (ll. 27-30)

The Folio has more words than the Quarto and some of these words are different, but surely these are not logical reasons for saying that the Quarto is meaningless and nonsensical. Both texts make perfectly good sense. "As how" in Q refers to "cause" and questions the ambiguity. "As who" in F refers to "so bad a Peere." But Miss Doran, evidently proceeding on the a priori assumption that the Quarto is corrupt, even though she has allowed the possibility of a compositor's omission in Gloucester's question, denies that possibility when she says that Suffolk's "Why not, etc." is meaningless. Further insisting on the corruption of Q, she ignores Suffolk's "so bad a cause" saying, "Even supposing that 'As how . . . ?' is a misprint for 'As who . . . ?' the question is nonsensical . . ." ²⁰ The fact of the matter is that Q makes perfectly good sense and that Suffolk's "Why not, etc." clearly indicates that part of Gloucester's speech has been omitted. There is no need to assume a reporter; there is, in fact, no logical reason to interpret this passage as evidence for memorial reconstruction. If, however, one makes the initial assumption that Q is a "bad" quarto, the work of a pirate or a reporter, and then proceeds to interpret certain restricted evidence to agree with this hypothesis, then alternate explanations and a mass of other evidence must necessarily be rejected.

If we will proceed further in this quarrel between Gloucester and the Cardinal we encounter unique Quarto material which once again has escaped the notice of most of those interested in memorial reconstruction.

Card. Let me be blessed for the peace I make,
Against this proud Protector with my sword.

Humphrey. Faith holy vnckle, I would it were come to that.

Cardinall. Euen when thou darest.

Humphrey. Dare. I tell thee Priest, Plantagenets could
neuer brooke the dare.

Card. I am Plantagenet as well as thou, and sonne to Iohn of
Gaunt.

20. *Op. cit.*, p. 15.

Humph. In Bastardie.

Cardin. I scorne thy words. (ll. 30-9)

Lines 35-9 do not appear in F nor is there any reference in that text to Plantagenets, John of Gaunt, or bastardy. Are we to assume a reporter-historian who, for some unknown reason, added these lines, or should we regard the lack of these lines in F as due to excision? The latter seems more reasonable, particularly when we remember that both the Cardinal and his elder brother, John, Earl of Somerset, were born out of wedlock, and that Margaret Beaufort, mother of Henry VII, was the granddaughter of this John. In the 1580's it might have been possible to have escaped trouble for having uttered on the stage such thoughts about the legitimacy of one line of Elizabeth's descent, but certainly in the 90's Tilney would never have passed a MS containing these lines. It would thus seem that once again we have evidence of revision.

Miss Doran's third category proving memorial reconstruction is Sir Walter Greg's "Anticipations and Recollections." These are words or phrases incorrectly inserted in the text by the reporter who remembers a similar word or phrase that has already appeared or who anticipates a word or phrase actually occurring later in the play. The reporter may also remember lines from other plays in which he has appeared and may insert these into his reported text. Sir Edmund Chambers noted five such phenomena in the Quarto: three derive from within the play and two derive from 3 *Henry VI*. Miss Doran says that she has counted 24 examples, but she limits her discussion to three examples, only one of which is an exact verbal parallel. Neither Sir Edmund nor Miss Doran seems to have noticed that the Folio text contains examples of this type of thing. York's soliloquy at the end of I.i contains the following lines.

Cold newes for me: for I had hope of France,
Euen as I haue of fertile Englands soile. (ll. 237-8) •

In III.i York, hearing that all France is now lost, begins an aside with these words:

Cold Newes for me: for I had hope of France,
As firmly as I hope for fertile England. (ll. 87-8)

This repetition is also found in Q, but the Folio has several interesting examples which are not found in the other text. In York's soliloquy the Folio contains a repetition not found in Q.

Aniou and *Maine* are giuen to the French, . . . (l. 214)
Aniou and *Maine* both giuen vnto the French? (l. 236)

Only the second of these lines appears in Q. In V.ii Old Clifford enters to Warwick and York; the latter claims the right of combat saying,

Hold Warwick: seek thee out some other chace
For I my selfe must hunt this Deere to death. (ll. 14-15)

In *3 Henry VI* (II.iv) Richard and Young Clifford are fighting when Warwick enters. Richard echoes his father's words from the other play.

Nay Warwicke, single out some other Chace,
For I my selfe will hunt this Wolfe to death. (ll. 12-13)

Q contains the lines found in F, but the Quarto of *3 Henry VI* does not contain Richard's lines.

The scene of Eleanor's public penance also raises some interesting problems. Gloucester commenting on the approaching punishment, part of which was that Eleanor should walk barefoot, says,

Unneath may shee endure the Flintie Streets, . . . (l. 8)

Eleanor herself comments on this a few lines later.

The ruthlesse Flint doth cut my tender feet (l. 34)

Q does not contain Gloucester's line but it does have a variant of Eleanor's. Another echo is found in two speeches by the Duchess.

For whilst I thinke I am thy married Wife,
And thou a Prince, Protector of this Land; . . . (ll. 28-9)

Sometime Ile say, I am Duke *Humfreyes* Wife,
And he a Prince, and Ruler of the Land: . . . (ll. 42-3)

Q does not contain l. 29 but it does have a variant of l. 43.

Echoes are also found in the Folio version of the conjuring scene (I.iv). York, after breaking in, addresses Eleanor,

Beldam I thinke we watcht you at an ynch. (l. 45)

A few lines later he praises his companion.

Lord Buckingham, me thinkes you watcht her well. (l. 58)

Something has gone wrong here. First York says, "we watcht" and then he says that Buckingham alone watched. The Quarto raises no such problem since it does not contain York's line to Buckingham.

The scene of Gloucester's murder reveals the same type of thing. In the Folio (III.ii) the first murderer tells an accomplice,

Runne to my Lord of Suffolke: let him know
We haue dispatcht the Duke, as he commanded. (ll. 1-2)

In a line or two Suffolk enters to inquire,

Now Sirs, haue you dispatcht this thing? (l. 6)

As we have noted, the Quarto's stage business is different. The curtains are drawn, the audience sees the actual murder taking place, and Suffolk enters with the question:

How now sir, what haue you dispatcht him? (l. 1)

Unless we are to regard the Folio text itself as an example of memorial reconstruction, we should attempt some explanation of these anticipations and recollections. Fortunately we do have definite evidence that revision can give such results and the evidence will be found in the next chapter.

Miss Doran finds certain variations in the order of events in Folio and Quarto as a fourth sign of the work of a reporter. She discusses in detail I.iii and I.i, as examples of "Transpositions", wrought by the faulty memory of the reporter. At least two transpositions seem to have escaped her notice, for she does not, in this connection, notice the transposition of the Spirit's prophecies (I.iv in F; II.i in Q), or the petitioners' complaints (I.iii). In considering the

first of these in Chapter 2, I suggested that the Quarto was superior dramatically to the Folio in avoiding the repetition of the prophecies only a few lines after they first appeared and in placing the repetition in II.i so that the whole Court, as well as the interested parties, the King, Suffolk, and Somerset, could hear the dread portents. It is on similar grounds of dramatic superiority that Miss Doran attacks Q as the work of a reporter. In I.iii, which was discussed at length in Chapter 4, the Folio's handling of Gloucester's exit and entrance is superior to that of Q; therefore, according to Miss Doran, Q is the work of a reporter, but she does not mention Q's superiority to F in the conjuring scene.

There are other variations in I.iii than those noted by Miss Doran. The beginning of the scene contains the episode of the petitioners which, it will be remembered, was related to the Folio's treatment of the Queen. The shift from Suffolk to the Queen as the principal figure is not an isolated phenomenon, it is part of a general change in a character.

The transpositions in IV.i (the murder of Suffolk) cannot be isolated from the unique Folio poetry, the distinct variations in business and content, and the corruption of the Folio text, which are all found in this scene. The variations in playing and the poetry have been discussed in the appropriate chapters and we have noted one of the transpositions, that involving Suffolk's reaction to the name Walter (Water). The dialogue between Suffolk and the Lieutenant (Captain in Q) is quite differently ordered in the two texts, as the reader may perceive by referring to the relevant passage in the Appendix. From a dramatic point of view both texts are acceptable, but the Folio does sum up, as the Quarto does not, the various charges made against Suffolk and so justifies, to a certain extent, his murder.

In the course of this dialogue there are difficulties in the Folio text which modern editors partially resolve by reference to the Quarto. For example, in the Folio we have:

Whit. The Duke of Suffolk, muffled vp in ragges? .

Suf. I, but these ragges are no part of the Duke.

Lieu. But Ioue was never slaine as thou shalt be,

Obscure and lowsie Swaine, King *Henries* blood.

Suf. The honourable blood of Lancaster
Must not be shed by such a iaded Groome: . . . (ll. 46-52)

This is clarified by the Quarto:

Cap. The Duke of Suffolke folded vp in rags.

Suf. I sir, but these rags are no part of the Duke,
Ioue sometime went disguisde, and why not I?

Cap. I but Ioue was neuer slaine as thou shalt be.

Suf. Base Iadie groome, King *Henries* blood
The honourable blood of Lancaster,
Cannot be shead by such a lowly swaine, . . . (ll. 30-6)

Not only has F omitted the line containing the reference to Jove in disguise, but part of Suffolk's speech has been given to the Lieutenant. It is manifest that there was something wrong with the Folio copy at this point, and it is difficult to be sure that modern editors are correct in giving "Obscure and lowsie Swaine" as well as "King *Henries* blood" to Suffolk. In line 65 Walter inquires, "Speak Captaine, shall I stab the forlorn Swain," so it is clear that the earlier epithet could also be applied to Suffolk.

A few lines later the Folio is again corrupt.

Lieu. Conuey him hence, and on our long boats side,
Strike off his head. *Suf.* Thou dar'st not for thy owne.

Lieu. Poole, Sir Poole? Lord,
I kennell, puddle, sinke, whose filth and dirt
Troubles the siluer Spring, where England drinkes: . . .
(ll. 68-72)

The Quarto shows what is wrong.

Cap. Ile waffe thee to thy death, go Water take him hence,
And on our long boates side, chop off his head.

Suf. Thou darste not for thine owne.

Cap. Yes Poull.

Suffolke. Poull.

Cap. I Poull, puddle, kennell, sinke and durt,
Ile stop that yawning mouth of thine, . . . (ll. 39-45)

The Folio has omitted a speech ascription for Suffolk, but if we observe the bibliographical evidence we may see what probably happened. It will be noticed that Suffolk's "Thou dar'st, etc." is printed on the same line as the conclusion of the Lieutenant's speech. Presumably this reflects the MS, which thus gives an indication of crowding. The next lines must have read something like this:

Lieu. Poole. Suf. Poole? Lieu. Poole
I kennell etc.

Such crowding with missing or incorrect speech ascriptions when considered with the other evidence indicates the revisionary nature of this scene in the Folio; for, although the Quarto clarifies, it does not give an exact reading for F. But let us consider another interesting variant in the present scene. In Q Suffolk says,

This villain being but Captain of a Pinnais,
Threatens more plagues then mightie Abradas,
The great Masadonian Pyrate, . . . (ll. 50-2)

In F we read:

. . . This Villaine here
Being Captaine of a Pinnace threatens more
Then *Bargulus* the strong Illyrian Pyrate. (ll. 106-8)

Here we have two different references; both are accurate; and neither is a corruption of the other. "Abradas the great Masadonian Pyrate" is a phrase appearing in two works by Robert Greene, *Penelope's Web* (1587) and *Menaphon* (1589).²¹ *Bargulus* of Illyria is found in Cicero's *De Officiis* and the translations thereof by Whytinton (1534) and Grimald (1553).²² Both pirates have a definite literary origin, but as far as I know neither is otherwise mentioned in the drama. The notoriety of King Cambyses or

21. Steevens was the first to note the connection with *Penelope's Webb* (1821 *Variorum*, 18, 289).

H. C. Hart (*Il Henry VI*, *op. cit.*, p. 133) noted the reference in *Menaphon*.

22. Warburton (1821 *Variorum*, *ibid.*) noted Cicero and Farmer (*ibid.*) noted the translations.

Hieronimo was not theirs and Ancient Pistol was probably not familiar with their reputations. The literary nature of the references seems to preclude a theory of faulty memory as an explanation of the variations; both names seem to be the certain responsibility of the author in each case.

Miss Doran's fifth category "Omissions" need not detain us long. She mentions two examples from Q (V.i.108-11 and I.i.93-104). These I would attribute to poor copy with resultant mistakes by the compositor. We have just seen two examples of omission in the Folio text of IV.i, and I see no reason to assume that the omissions in Q have a different origin.

After her examination of Q, Miss Doran turns to "A Bibliographical Examination" of the two texts. If I am correct, her argument runs something like this: Q is a secondary text and the problem is to prove that it was derived from F. F shows evidences of revision. These revisions are found in Q. Therefore Q is derived from F.²³

The evidence advanced by Miss Doran to prove that Q is a secondary text has been examined in detail and has been found wanting; therefore since her first premise is unsound, the rest of the argument is invalid. One example she cites will suffice. She believes that the episode of the petitioners (I.iii) exists in a revised form in F, and her evidence is not the alterations of order or the elevation of the Queen to the central position but the fact that she finds rhythmical fragments in what is printed as prose. The reader is invited to examine these rhythmical fragments as marked by Miss Doran²⁴ to determine whether the cause is an original in verse which has been revised as prose or whether the natural rhythm of Elizabethan prose is the explanation.

As Sir Edmund Chambers remarks, "They [verse fragments] are a constant feature of Shakespeare's prose. They are most frequent in the comedies of his mid-career, such as *As You Like It* and *Twelfth Night*. But there are many also in *Coriolanus* and *Winter's Tale*, and no play is altogether without them."²⁵ In other

23. *Op. cit.*, p. 31.

24. *Ibid.*, pp. 34-5.

25. *Op. cit.*, I, 233.

words, verse fragments are not evidence of revision. As a matter of fact, only one of the hypothetical verse fragments cited by Miss Doran appears in Q and that is a very commonplace expression.

What's here?

A complaint against the Duke of *Suffolke* for enclosing the commons of long Melford.

The Folio passage, with her indications of accented syllables, reads differently.

. . . What's heére? Agaínst the Dúke of
Súffolke, for enclosing the Commons of Melforde.²⁶

That these four accented syllables constitute proof of revision which is incorporated in Q is manifestly absurd. The phrase "against, etc." was a standard formula in petitions of the time, as, for example:

Against Georg Gáscoyne y^t he óught not tó be Búrgess ²⁷

A strong iambic rhythm can also be found frequently in Holinshed.

The articles betwixt king Henrie and the duke of York ²⁸

. . . the root and bottome of this long festured canker is not
yet extirpate, . . . ²⁹

But venem will breake out, & inward grudge will soone appeare, . . . ³⁰

It would seem, therefore, that verse fragments do not constitute substantial evidence for revision.

The other evidence put forward by Miss Doran to prove the precedence of the Folio in this scene (I.iii) is also questionable.

. . . every idea and indeed every phrase of the Folio (except the names *Iohn Goodman* and *Thomas Horner*, and the addi-

26. *Op. cit.*, p. 35.

27. P. R. O. State Papers, Domestic, Vol. 86, No. 59.

28. *The Whole Volume of Chronicles* (1587), 3, 657.

29. *Ibid.*, p. 655.

30. *Ibid.*, p. 622.

tion of "House and Lands" to the theft committed by the Cardinal's man against the First Petitioner) from line 7 to line 39 is in the Quarto. This fact points to the precedence of the Folio. The texts could not have evolved from a common source, one by revision and the other by degradation, and come out of it without divergence.³¹

Here again we have the hypothesis that Q is a derived text as the starting point. If, however, we consider Q as the basis of F, then many things are understandable. As has been pointed out, the variant order of the petitioners in F seems to be linked with the Folio's emphasis on the Queen, and its consequent relegation of Suffolk to a position of less importance. The ideas which are common to the two texts are the three petitions and as Miss Doran says, Q does not contain details here found in F. As for the identity of phrasing, let us consider the following passage from F and its parallel in Q.

Queene. What say'st thou? Did the Duke of Yorke
say, hee was rightfull heire to the Crowne?

Peter. That my Mistresse was? No forsooth: my Master
said, That he was, and that the King was an Vsurper.

(ll. 28-31)

Queene. Didst thou say the King was an vsurper?

Peter. No forsooth, I saide my maister saide so,
Th'other day when we were scowring the Duke
of Yorks Armour in our garret. (ll. 25-8)

The Folio contains the erroneous "Mistresse" for "Master," the Queen's question is different and there is no reference to scouring armor. The Quarto does not then contain "every phrase of the Folio," with the exceptions noted by Miss Doran. Furthermore, Q contains a detail not in F. Miss Doran's evidence does not therefore prove the precedence of the Folio.

The remainder of her "Bibliographical Examination" is devoted to other verse fragments and the objections that have been raised apply with equal validity; so on two counts—an unwarranted

31. *Op. cit.*, pp. 35-6.

assumption that Q is a secondary text and unconvincing evidence to prove it—we must abandon the hypothesis of the Folio's priority.

One modification introduced by Miss Doran remains to be noticed. Conceding that Young Clifford's speech in V.ii of the Folio "is a possible piece of later rewriting" she continues, "Although there are possibly a number of similar instances of later touching up, every expanded speech in the Folio cannot be considered. It is precisely the long figurative harangues or soliloquies that an adapter would cut."³²

An example of this type of abridgment, according to Miss Doran, is York's "*Aniou* and *Maine*" soliloquy at the end of I.i. Those lines unique in F do not appear in Q because an adapter deleted them from the text which was reported. She concludes, "It is at least as logical to suppose an omission of undramatic and bunglesome matter as an addition of poetic metaphors." This theory of an adapter's deletions is also held by Hart and it will be well to postpone discussion of it for the time being.

Miss Doran's final conclusions as to the origin of Q may be briefly stated. She suggests that a company known as Pembroke's Men was touring the provinces in 1592-93 and that it presented *2* and *3 Henry VI* from memory, the promptbook having been left in London. Either in the country or on their return to London, the actors made up their own promptbook based on their memory of the original. This they sold to Millington because of their indigence.

Alfred Hart

In 1942 Professor Alfred Hart published a general study of the "Bad Quartos," among which he included *The First Part of the Contention*. This he regarded as a surreptitious play, a corrupt abridgment derived from the acting version of the play printed in the Folio. Five other "Bad Quartos" are grouped with *The Contention* for general study because "most editors," in Hart's words, "have discussed the relationship between each pair of these parallel

32. *Ibid.*, p. 61.

texts as an isolated phenomenon or special problem affecting one play of Shakespeare, and have lost sight of the fact that some broad principle must condition the sixfold repetition of this phenomenon or problem.”³³

Accordingly we find in Hart’s book nothing resembling the detailed study made by Miss Doran. Five passages are quoted from *The Contention* as illustrative of its bad style, and the purpose of this is to show that F is superior to Q. The reason for the superiority is that F is “Shakespeare’s authentic text” and Q is a corruption thereof.³⁴ Six passages are quoted as illustrative of non-Shakespearean verse, i.e., lines that have no parallel in F.³⁵ Six more passages are cited in a chapter entitled “Blunders That Bear Witness,” and once again we encounter those errors which are thought to illustrate faulty memory: York’s claim to the throne; the omitted line in the quarrel between Gloucester and the Cardinal; another omission in V.i; a variant line in II.iv; a misprint in III.ii; and finally the nonappearance in Q of the conclusion of IV.ix.³⁶ Forty-four lines containing more or less than 10 syllables are cited as evidence of the reporter’s corruption of the iambic pentameter pattern of Shakespeare’s verse.³⁷ Eight examples of repetition are found in Q.³⁸ Parallel passages between Q and F and other Elizabethan plays are provided, and there is a discussion of the stage directions in Q.³⁹

The foregoing evidences of corruption vary little from those produced by Miss Doran. Since we have already seen that these same phenomena appear in good texts and therefore do not constitute valid evidence for or against the theory of memorial reconstruction, it remains to examine Hart’s statistical study of vocabulary, which he regards as certain demonstration of a reporter.⁴⁰

The basis of this vocabulary test is a statistical analysis of pairs of plays by which means Hart proposes to test similar statistics

33. *Stolne and Surreptitious Copies*, p. 119.

34. *Ibid.*, pp. 93-5.

35. *Ibid.*, pp. 110-11.

36. *Ibid.*, pp. 203-13.

37. *Ibid.*, pp. 243-4, 246-7, 251, 253-4, 263-4.

38. *Ibid.*, p. 322.

39. *Ibid.*, pp. 354-6.

40. *Ibid.*, pp. 21-40.

derived from an analysis of a "Bad Quarto" with its Folio counterpart. Thus the evidence found in a comparison of plays whose texts are sound will be a control by which to judge the vocabulary statistics of a pair of plays, one of which is thought to be a reported text. The pairs used as controls are source plays such as *The Troublesome Raigne* which is compared with *King John*, Shakespeare plays of allied or varied subject matter, and non-Shakespearean plays of like nature. The crux of the matter, according to Hart, is the percentage of exclusive words found in a play analyzed under these conditions: a reporter will remember only the usual or common words, therefore a "Bad Quarto" will show a much smaller percentage of words found in it and not in its companion text.

There is but one objection to this procedure: the control should be a norm; it should duplicate as nearly as possible the material to be evaluated. Hart's controls are not norms since he compares plays of approximately the same length, whereas there is a marked difference in length between *The Contention* (1972 lines) and *2 Henry VI* (3075 lines). To be valid the control should approximate this lineation. Furthermore, the control should approximate the nature of the two texts to be examined. Hart believes that *The Contention* was abridged before it was reported.⁴¹ Abridgment would, according to him, delete those poetic passages ("rigmарole") which have no relation to plot. Now it is evident that such passages contain a very high percentage of infrequently used words and these are the major source of exclusive words; therefore one play of the control pair should be an abridgment from which such passages and such words have been deleted. Since his controls thus fail in two essential respects, we must reject his conclusions.

We have noted that Hart believes in a theory of abridgment, and although this per se has nothing to do with memorial reconstruction, it will be well to consider the problem since both Sir Edmund Chambers and Miss Doran also postulate an abridgment before corruption. Hart believes that all plays of the period were performed in two hours, and that 2400 lines represents the length of a

41. *Ibid.*, pp. 1, 119-33.

play presented in such a time period. He, therefore, believes that any play longer than 2400 lines was abridged in order to meet this limit.⁴² In the case of the "Bad Quartos," the Folio represents the original play which was abridged to 2400 lines and then memorially reconstructed with the reporter forgetting, in the case of *The Contention*, another 500 lines.

As far as the facts of the case go, we know of two kinds of abridgment in the Elizabethan theater. The first is represented by Peele's *Battle of Alcazar*. Sir Walter Greg succinctly summarizes the nature of the Quarto in comparison with the extant "plot" of the play: ". . . the Quarto represents a shortened and simplified version of the play designed for representation with the minimum of paraphernalia and in a limited time by a severely reduced cast, and furthermore that the manuscript was obtained by transcription and deliberate revision from the prompt-copy containing the full version (upon which the Plot is likewise founded) and thus ultimately goes back to the author's own manuscript."⁴³ The Quarto contains 1591 type lines or 1452 verse lines.

The other type of abridgment, although known to exist, is far less certain. From references by Jonson (1600), Barnes (1607), Webster (1623), Brome (1640), and Humphrey Moseley (1647), we know that a printed text frequently contained material which had not been used on the stage.⁴⁴ Now these references are found in prefaces by the author, or, in the case of Moseley, the publisher. In the case of the authors cited it is clear that each one prepared his copy for the printer and quite naturally wished to preserve his every line for posterity. A paramount difficulty, however, is that none of these men has told us how much of the play the actors deleted. Are we then, in lieu of any direct statement, to accept Hart's two-hour, 2400-line limit?

There are two objections to this proposition. The two-hour limit is by no means as absolute as Hart would have it to be. A 1594

42. *Ibid.*, p. 122.

43. *Two Elizabethan Stage Abridgments*, pp. 45-6.

44. E. K. Chambers, *The Elizabethan Stage* (4 vols.; Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1923), 3, 193. William Bracy, *The Merry Wives of Windsor: The History and Transmission of Shakespeare's Text*, The University of Missouri Studies, 25, No. 1 (1952), 76.

order from the Lord Chamberlain, the patron of Shakespeare's company, to the Lord Mayor says that the players shall begin their performances at two o'clock and "haue don betweene fower and fiae," indicating a performance time of two to three hours.⁴⁵ Ben Jonson in the Induction to *Bartholomew Fair* (1614) gives "two houres and an halfe, and somewhat more" as the duration of that play, which, although written in prose, greatly exceeds 2400 verse lines.⁴⁶ In the Herford and Simpson text it totals 3974. Dekker (1609) gives three hours as the duration of performance.⁴⁷ Earlier references by Fenton (1574) and Northbrooke (1577) mention two or three hours.⁴⁸ The Elizabethans were notoriously casual in giving any figure, so that the well-known "two hours traffic of our stage" may well be interpreted as from 100 to 150 minutes rather than a rigid 120 minutes. Nor should we forget that Court performances usually lasted three hours, and sometimes longer.⁴⁹ The Chamberlain's Men, as we also know, frequently played at Court, so it is even possible that Q₂ of *Hamlet* might have been performed there in its entirety.

A second objection is Hart's insistence on a fixed length of 2400 lines. He tells us that "the average length of all extant plays (exclusive of Jonson's) with sound texts written between 1587 and 1616 does not much exceed 2400 lines."⁵⁰ A moment's reflection reveals that this is of no significance, for any number of plays of this period exceed this arbitrary figure. *The Spanish Tragedy* (1602) has 3260 lines; *Sir John Oldcastle* (1600), 2718; Marlowe's *Edward II*, 2888; *The First Part of Richard the Second* (ca. 1594), 2989. In order to have an average length of 2400 lines for all plays, some must have been considerably shorter than 2400 lines. A case in point is the MS play *Edmund Ironside* which Hart uses as an illustration of abridgment.⁵¹ In the left margin of the MS of this

45. *Elizabethan Stage*, 4, 316.

46. C. H. Herford and P. Simpson, eds., *Ben Jonson* (11 vols.; Oxford, 1925-52), 8, 15.

47. *Elizabethan Stage*, 2, 533, n. 1.

48. *Ibid.*, 4, 195, 198.

49. *Ibid.*, 1, 225.

50. *Op. cit.*, p. 122.

51. *Stolne and Surreptitious Copies*, pp. 126-30.

play there are deletion marks for a large number of passages. The total number of lines to be cut is 196. If we subtract this from the total length of the play, we have a text of 1759 lines, exclusive of stage directions. According to the editor of the Malone Society Reprint "the play was prepared for acting and was in all probability acted."⁵² The stage adapter not only marked passages for deletion, he made additions, corrected errors, and wrote in the names of the actors who were to take various minor parts. Thus we have an instance of a play that required but one hour and a half for its performance instead of two hours.

The same MS collection in which *Edmund Ironside* is found contains a number of other prompt copies. There is, for example, *The First Part of Richard the Second* which has 2989 lines.⁵³ Nine passages are clearly marked for deletion and these total 83 lines so that the actual playing text was 2896 lines, very nearly 500 more than Hart's 2400, and thus requiring almost two hours and a half for performance. *The Two Noble Ladies* has 2111 lines but since one leaf is missing in the MS the total should be 2221.⁵⁴ The only deletions are brief, usually consisting of a few words. These are not the work of anyone in the playhouse but are the result of the author's revisions. *Charlemagne*, a text of 2571 lines, has 15 passages marked for deletion with a total of 155 lines, so the acting length is 2416.⁵⁵ *The Launching of the Mary* contains extensive deletions and additions.⁵⁶ Approximately 700 lines are cut but 450 are added, so that the final acting length is around 2700 lines.

It seems evident that we cannot make any hard and fast rule about the duration of performances or the length of plays. About all we can say is that plays on the stage varied in length by as much as 1000 lines, and the duration of performance ran from one hour and a half to something around two hours and a half, or perhaps longer. Nor can we be very certain as to the extent of abridgment. This too is a variable factor ranging from the drastic treatment

52. *Edmond Ironside*, Malone Society Reprints, 1827, p. vii.

53. Malone Society Reprints, 1929.

54. *Ibid.*, 1930.

55. *Ibid.*, 1937 (1938).

56. *Ibid.*, 1933.

accorded *The Battle of Alcazar* to the relatively minor deletions found in *The First Part of Richard the Second*.

There is a real distinction between these two kinds of abridgment: the first adapts a play for a small company, presumably on tour and anxious to avoid as much paraphernalia as possible. The other is not as easily described. The nine cuts in *The First Part of Richard the Second* vary from one line to 43. The others are 6, 2, 2, 20, 2, 4, and 13. The longest cut eliminates part of a conversation between the Queen and two duchesses on the sad state of England. The second in length deletes comment on the farming out of the kingdom. One cut (6 lines) takes out an explanation of the Black Prince's name and the resultant sequence of lines does not make sense. Some of the other cuts seem purely arbitrary. In fact it is hard to find any principle at work. If the adapter had wanted to cut unessential material or poetry, he could easily have cut a great deal more. What was gained by cutting 93 lines out of 2989 is equally puzzling. Not more than five or ten minutes playing time is saved. Perhaps we shall not be far wrong if we describe such cutting as a sort of eclectic "tightening up" done by someone in the theater.

The variant lengths of *The Contention* and *2 Henry VI* are not explained by either type of abridgment. Both plays require the same number of actors and the same paraphernalia, so there is nothing analogous with *The Battle of Alcazar*. In all the other plays which we have examined there is no parallel for the deletion of 1100 lines. At the most we could posit a loss of 300 by abridgment, leaving 800 to be accounted for. I can see only two alternatives: either 800 or more lines were forgotten by the hypothetical reporter or the whole 1100 lines were added during the process of revision.

Chapter 6. REVISION

The alternative to memorial reconstruction is revision and since we have seen that a reporter does not explain the variations between our two texts, it will be well to examine known examples of revision to see what changes are introduced, and to see if these are analogous in any way to the case at hand.

One interesting example of revision is found in the 1602 edition of *The Spanish Tragedy*. This was printed from a copy of the 1599 quarto but contains five passages of new or revised material. The last of these is found at the conclusion of Hieronimo's play when the stage is littered with corpses. Twenty-three lines of the original are replaced by 51 lines, but the bulk of the original is utilized by the reviser, as may be seen in the following comparison of the two versions.

Original

Vico. Why hast thou murdered my *Balthazar*?

Cas. Why hast thou butchered both my children thus?

Hiero. O good words, as deare to me was my *Horatio*,

As yours, or yours, or yours my L. to you.

My guiltles Sonne was by *Lorenzo* slaine,

And by *Lorenzo* and that *Balthazar*,

Am I at last reuenged thorowly.

Vpon whose soules may heauens be yet auenged,

With greater far then these afflictions.

Cas. But who were thy confederates in this?

Vice. That was thy daughter *Bel-imperia*.

For by her hand my *Balthazar* was slaine

I saw her stab him.

King. Why speakest thou not?

Hiero. What lesser libertie can Kings affoord

Then harmeles silence? then affoord it me:
Sufficeth I may not, nor I will not tell thee.

King. Fetch forth the tortures.

Traitor as thou art, ile make thee tell.

Hiero. Indeed thou maiest torment me as his wretched
Sonne,

Hath done in murdring my *Horatio*.

But neuer shalt thou force me to reueale,

The thing which I haue vowd inuiolate:

And therefore in despight of all thy threats,

Pleasde with their deaths, and easde with their reuenge:

First take my tung, and afterwards my hart. (ll. 2858-83) ¹

Revision

Vice. Why hast thou murdered my *Balthazar*?

Cast. Why hast thou butchered both my children thus?

Hier. But are you sure they are dead?

Cast. I, slaue, too sure.

Hier. What and yours too?

Vic. I, all are dead, not one of them suruiue.

Hier. Nay, then I care not, come, and we shall be friends,
Let vs lay our heades together,

See here's a goodly nowse will hold them all.

Vice. O damned Deuill, how secure he is.

Hier. Secure, why doest thou wonder at it.

I tell thee Vice-roy, this day I haue seene reueng'd,

And in that fight am growne a prowder Monarch,

Then euer sate vnder the Crowne of Spaine:

Had I as many lyues as there be Starres,

As many Heauens to go to, as those liues,

Ide giue them all, I and my soule to boote,

But I would see thee ride in this red poole.

Cast. Speake, Who were thy confederates in this?

Vic. That was thy daughter *Bel-imperia*,

For by her hand my *Balthazar* was slaine:

I saw her stab him.

Hie. O good words: as deare to me was my *Horatio*,

As yours, or yours, or yours my L. to you.
 My giltlesse sonne was by *Lorenzo* slaine,
 And by *Lorenzo*, and that *Balthazar*,
 Am I at last reuenged thorowly.
 Vpon whose soules may heauens be yet reuenged,
 With greater farre then these afflictions.
 Me thinkes since I grew inward with reuenge,
 I cannot looke with scorne enough on death.

King. What doest thou mocke vs slaue, bring torturs forth.

Hie. Doe, doe, doe, and meane time Ile torture you
 You had a sonne (as I take it) and your sonne,
 Should ha'e beene married to your daughter: ha, wast not so?
 You had a sonne too, he was my Lieges Nephew.
 He was proude and politicke, had he liued,
 He might a come to weare the crowne of Spaine,
 I thinke twas so: twas I that killed him,
 Looke you this same hand, twas it that stab'd
 His heart, Doe you see this hand?
 For one *Horatio*, if you euer knew him
 A youth, one that they hanged vp in his fathers garden:
 One that did force your valiant sonne to yeelde,
 While your more valiant sonne did take him prisoner:
Vis. Be deafe my sences, I can heare no more.
King. Fall heauen, and couer vs with thy sad ruines,
Cast. Rowle all the world within thy pitchy cloud.
Hie. Now doe I applaud what I haue acted.

Nunck mers cadæ manus.

Now to expresse the rapture of my part,
 First take my tongue, and afterward my heart. (ll. 3124-75) ²
He bites out his tongue.

The reviser's purpose seems clear: he seeks to build up this highly dramatic scene by emphasizing the suffering of, the be-reaved and by having Hieronimo gloat over this suffering and vaunt his dreadful vengeance. This is achieved by adding new business such as the hangman's noose, which Hieronimo offers to share with the parents of his victims, and by adding to the rather sparse

2. *Ibid.*, 1925.

imagery of the original some rather effective lines. A part of the original can be worked in but certain changes are necessary. First we should notice the transposition of Castile's question, "But who were thy confederates in this?" and the Viceroy's comment, "That was thy daughter." In the original these followed Hieronimo's "O, good words, etc.," but in the revision they precede this speech. The reason for this alteration lies in the reviser's decision to use part of the original. If Hieronimo is to say "O good words, etc." he must have some point of reference. In the original the "good words" are Castile's "Why hast thou butchered both my children thus?" In the revision new material has been added at this point and so the reviser, in order to give point to Hieronimo's satisfaction, transposes the Viceroy's speech describing Bel-imperia's murder of Balthazar. Thus the death of one of Horatio's murderers affords an occasion for Hieronimo's exclamation.

In one respect the reviser improves the sense of the original. There the King threatens torture to make Hieronimo speak, but just what it is the King wishes to learn is uncertain. Castile's request was for the names of Hieronimo's confederates and the answer to this was given by the Viceroy, who named Bel-imperia. There seems to be no further information, because the royal party witnessed the play, saw the murders committed, and then listened to a long harangue in which Hieronimo explained what had happened and why. The reviser deleted the pointless questioning and used the threat of torture as the King's revenge on Hieronimo.

On the other hand, the reviser adds to the redundancy of the original. In both texts Hieronimo offers a full explanation of the slaughter, then in his "O good words" he again explains his vengeance. The reviser adds still another reiteration. After the King threatens torture Hieronimo replies, "Ile torture you," and once again we hear the story of vengeance. Here, however, the theme is Hieronimo's gloating over the victims of his vengeance and is therefore a necessary part of the reviser's build-up of the scene.

The result of the revision is textual variation very similar to that which we found in a comparison of *The Contention* and *2 Henry VI*. For example, the repetition may be compared with the Folio's double attack on Gloucester in III.i, whereas Q contains only one.

Other similarities are found in the transposition of speeches and the introduction of variant words. The added material also resembles that unique in F. A re-enforcing of ideas, the introduction of new themes, and a stylistic variation from the original—all these are characteristic of the material found in F but not in Q.

An even more striking example of the textual variation caused by revision is found in the well-known *Book of Sir Thomas More*.³ The extant MS contains some 1900 lines of the original and approximately 700 lines of revision. Two of the six passages of revision are new material, while the remaining four represent a reworking of scenes in the original. Throughout the whole MS there are frequent interlineations, passages marked for deletion, and in one instance a reviser's marginal annotation: "This must be newe written." The entire scene following this notation is marked for deletion, but the exact length of the original is uncertain because one or more leaves have been removed from the MS, so that we have only the beginning and the end. Enough remains, however, for us to understand the main purpose of revision.

In the original, More plans to receive the learned Clerk Erasmus and, characteristically, plans a jest to trick his guest. The servant, Randall, is to impersonate More. Unfortunately the break in the MS occurs just as Erasmus begins a Latin address to the feigned Chancellor. When the MS picks up again More is engaged in another jest, the object of his humor being this time Master Morris' servant, Faulkener, who refuses to have his hair cut and is thus a most repulsive figure. Faulkener excuses his appearance on the grounds that he is bound by a vow not to cut his hair for three years. More regards a vow as a holy thing and suggests a cell as the appropriate abode for such a votary, only the cell to which he sends Faulkener is in Newgate Prison. After the culprit is led away More briefly addresses the Sheriff of London and Morris returns with the news that Faulkener has recanted.

The reviser's major alteration is in the order of events. The scene begins much the same: More and Randall plan to deceive Erasmus but at this point Faulkener is led in by the Sheriff and after some colloquy More pronounces sentence. Following the de-

3. *Ibid.*, 1911.

parture to Newgate, there enters Erasmus in the company of the Earl of Surrey. The ensuing interview concludes with More sending his guests in to dinner while he talks with Morris who has just entered. Then the shorn Faulkener enters and after comic dialogue between him and More the scene ends.

It seems clear that the main purpose of revision was to separate the two appearances of Faulkener by something more than the 17-line speech to the Sheriff of London found in the original. By transposing the Erasmus episode, the reviser makes the whole scene far better dramatically. Thus we have another example, based on known evidence and not on an assumption, that transpositions are found in revised texts. Equally interesting are the other variations found in the case at hand. Both texts are given in the Appendix but it will be useful to compare short sections here so that the evidence may be ascertained. The initial dialogue between More and his servant well illustrates the problem.

Original

A table beeing couered with a greene Carpet, a state Cushion on it, and the Pursse and Mace lying thereon Enter Sir Thomas Moore and his man Randall with him, attyred like him.

Moore. Come on Sir, are you readie?

Ran. yes my Lord, I stand but vppon a fewe pointes, I shall haue doone presently,

Is it your honors pleasure that I should [be] growe proude now? (740)

Moore. I, I must haue thee proude, or else thou'lt nere be neere allyed to greatnesse: obserue me Sir.

The learned Clarke *Erasmus* is arriu'de within our Englishe Courte, this day I heare, he feasteth with an Englishe honourd Poett the Earle of Surrey, and I knowe this night the famous Clarke of *Roterdame* will visite Sir Thomas Moore, therefore Sir, act my parte, there, take my place furnishte with pursse and Mace. Ile see if great Erasmus can distinguishe merit and outward ceremonie: obserue me Sirra, (750)

who prates not much seemes wise his witt few scan
 while the [tog] tongue Blabs tales of the Imperfitt man.
 Ile see If greate Erasmus can distinguishe
 meritt and outward Cerimony

Rand. If I doe not deserve a share for playing of yo^r (20)
 Lo. well. lett me be yeoman vsher to yo^r Sumpster and be
 banisht from wearing of a gold chaine for ever

Moore. well sir Ile hide o^r motion act my part
 wth a firme Boldnes and thou winst my hart
 how now whats the matter.

The textual variations found in these few lines exhibit many of the characteristics which have been used by Madeleine Doran as criteria of memorial reconstruction. For example, we may notice a clear instance of a "recollection"; but the phenomenon is not due to faulty memory; it is the work of the reviser. In the original, Randall's remark: "[I] . . . haue learnde your shift so well" occurs after More's long speech. In the revision it precedes. In More's speech we note an alteration in order. The lines "Ile see if great Erasmus, etc." appear in the original midway in the speech. In the revision they are More's conclusion; but the variation is not caused by faulty memory, it is the result of conscious rewriting. Similarly the original has a repetition which might also be regarded as a reporter's "recollection." In line 742 we find the phrase "obserue me Sir" and in line 751 "obserue me Sirra." Only the first of these appears in the revision and it is an amalgamation, "obserue me Sirra." The second appearance of the phrase in the original results in a hypermetrical line. Again we have "evidence" for memorial reconstruction, since Miss Doran regards corrupt verse arising from such insertions as part of the proof for the existence of a reporter. We know, however, that no reporter is involved in this play; the reviser recast the original, and in so doing deleted the repetition. It would appear then that Hart's observation, "Repetition and anticipation of lines and phrases are an infallible sign of corruption," is in need of serious modification.

Another type of recollection or anticipation regarded as signifi-

cant by the proponents of memorial reconstruction is the use of a phrase or a line taken from another play. That phenomenon may also be illustrated in the original. More tells Randall,

Ile be thy glasse, dresse thy behaiour
according to my cariage, . . .

This bears close resemblance to Lady Percy's description of Hotspur:

He was indeed the glass
Wherein the noble youth did dress themselves.

(2H4, II.iii.21-22)

The appearance of this figure in the original and its nonappearance in the revision is not, however, due to a reporter's piecing out his imperfect memory with recollections from another play. The explanation is simple; the reviser merely deleted in the course of rewriting.

We also learn from this passage that a reviser produced variants. For example, the original has Erasmus feasting with Surrey "this day" and visiting More "this night." For no discernible reason the reviser gives these terms as "Last night" and "to day." Similarly the reviser deletes or adds details for no apparent reason. In the original we read

there, take my place furnishte with pursse and Mace.

The reviser simply says,

. . . therfore sir take my seate
yo" are Lord Chauncelor.

On the other hand the original reads

. . . if I doo it not in kew, let your Lordship bannishe me
from the wearing of a golde chaine for euer.

The reviser adds to this:

If I doe not deserve a share for playing of yo^r Lo. well. lett me
be yeoman vsher to yo^r Sumpter and be banisht from wear-
ing of a gold chaine for ever

With the first of these, the reviser's deletion, we may compare the following from *The Contention*. Peter, the armorer's man is answering the Queen's inquiry about the King being an usurper.

No forsooth I saide my maister saide so,
th'other day when we were scouring the
Duke of *Yorks* Armour in our garret. (I.iii.26-28)

The Folio contains no reference to "scouring."

Finally we should notice that the last four lines of More's speech in the revision exist in the original in a different position and are not sequent. Such amalgamation or separation, as the case may be, is usually considered another evidence of memorial construction.

The scene between Erasmus and More's servant which begins with the entry of the famous scholar is unfortunately cut short in the original where one or more pages is missing, but we do have some 20-odd lines which are paralleled by the revision and the same characteristics appear. One very interesting variant is the disposition of the lines. The original has this speech by Erasmus:

Eras. His Lordship hath some weightie business sure,
for see, as yet he takes no notice of vs.
I thinke twere best I doo my dutie to him
in a short Latine speech.

The reviser divides this between Erasmus and Surrey.

Surry. his Lo hath some waightie Busines
for see as yett he takes noe notice of vs

Erasmus. I thinke twere best I did my dutie to him
in a short Latin speech.

The variation in tense occurs twice in other lines: "I longed"—"I long"; "Now doo you viewe"—"now shall yo^u vew." A rather strained metaphor in the original is deleted by the reviser.

In it, the Princes safetie, and the peace,
that shines vppon our cōmon weale, [is] are forgde.
vppon the golden Anuile of his braine.

In it the princes saftie and the [state] peace
that shines vppon o^r Comon wealth are forged
by Loiall Industrie

A six and one-half line speech by Erasmus is added at this point in the revision and a bit later a two-line speech by Surrey is deleted. Erasmus' "Latin Speech" survives in only its first line in the original, because of the missing sheets.

Cum tua virtus, (amplissim< >doctissime que vir)<

In the revision we find:

*Qui in Celiberima[]patria natus est ett
Gloriosa[]plus habet negotij et in [funem] Lucem veniat
quam qui*

In its treatment of the Faulkener episode the revision varies considerably from the original and again we have a parallel with *The Contention* and *2 Henry VI*. Some scenes of *The Contention* are as close to F as the More-Randall-Erasmus episode in its two versions. Other scenes are as divergent as the Faulkener episode. The facts are the same in both texts but the exact verbal parallels are few. Representative of the variation is More's speech committing Faulkener to Newgate:

Original

Sure, vowes are holy things, if they be made
to good intent, and Sir, you shall not say,
you were compelde by me to breake your vowe.
But till the expiration of the same,
because I will not haue ye walke the streetes,
for euery man to stand and wunder at,
I will cōmitt ye prisoner vnto Newgate.
Except meane time, your conscience giue you leaue,
to dispense with the long vow that you haue made •

Revision

vowes are recorded in the court of heaven.
for they are holly acts. yong man I charge thee

and doe advize thee start not from y^t vow
 and for I will be sure thou shalt not shreve
 besides because It is an odious sight
 to see a man thus hairie. thou shalt lie
 In Newgate till thy vow and thy three years
 be full expired. Away wth him

Sir Edmund Chambers' description of *The Contention* and *2 Henry VI* might well be applied to the foregoing. "Sometimes, again, the versions are little more than paraphrases of each other, with an occasional phrase in common, and sometimes complete paraphrases."⁴ Indeed comparison of the original and revised material of *The Book of Sir Thomas More* reveals a great many similarities with *The Contention* and *2 Henry VI*. Moreover such comparison has shown that practically all the criteria used to prove memorial reconstruction are found in an undeniable case of revision.⁵

4. *William Shakespeare*, 1, 281.

5. There are, of course, other examples of revision, but I have omitted those, since Sir Edmund Chambers regards Robert Wilmot's revision of *Gismond of Salerno* and Ben Jonson's revision of *Every Man in His Humour* as literary rather than theatrical in their nature (*William Shakespeare*, 1, 214). I cannot understand, however, Sir Edmund's insistence that "there is no evidence for any such practice of meticulous stylistic revision in the Elizabethan theatre (1, 282)" as that found in *2 Henry VI*. Surely *The Spanish Tragedy* and *The Book of Sir Thomas More* show exactly that kind of revision.

It is indeed fortunate that the MS of *More* survived and that the two texts of *The Spanish Tragedy* were printed. Otherwise our knowledge of revision would be based on the evidence of *Henslowe's Diary*. This has been fully considered by Albert Feuillerat in *The Composition of Shakespeare's Plays*, but it may not be amiss to cite one entry.

In 1602 Ben Jonson received £10 for additions to *The Spanish Tragedy* and the writing of a play called "Richard Crookback." Since the usual rate for a new play was £5 or £6, it would seem that the additions must have constituted rather extensive work, in fact, almost a complete revision; otherwise there can be no reason for such a large payment. This revision has not been preserved, because the 1602 Quarto cannot be the work for which a price nearly equivalent to that for a new play was paid. As a matter of fact the 1602 quarto almost certainly represents the revision which Henslowe records a "ne" performance in 1597.

The point is that there is no reason to expect that any large number of texts should be preserved in two states. In fact only two of the plays men-

tioned as revisions by Henslowe are in existence in this form: *The Spanish Tragedy* and *Dr. Faustus*. The second of these has recently been regarded by Sir Walter Greg as existing in a reported and original version, so the number of revised texts is thereby diminished, unless Sir Walter is proved incorrect in his judgment. At any rate *The Book of Sir Thomas More* cannot be interpreted on the grounds of memorial reconstruction; the evidence of the MS denies this, and I suggest that a good many "Bad Quartos" are original plays, not reported texts.

After all, there is not a single reference in Elizabethan literature to the memorial reconstruction of plays. If the practice was as widespread as we are nowadays led to believe, it seems very strange that the only extant specific reference to piracy which we have is Heywood's to stenography.

Chapter 7. CONCLUSIONS

In the beginning of this study I proposed to examine as fully as possible all the evidence which in any way had to do with the textual relationship of *The First Part of The Contention* and *2 Henry VI*. Thus we have studied a large body of material which had not been discussed by the proponents of the theory of memorial reconstruction. In the first instance the sources point inevitably to the fact that Q cannot have been derived from F. The variations in playing enforce this conclusion, while the style of the unique material in the Folio proves that we have to do with revision, for no theory of memory, even abetted by abridgment, can explain the absence of this material from the Quarto text. It should also be noted that the subject has been studied not in vacuo nor from the point of empiric generalities. While it is easy to say that the actors cut out poetic passages and so to dismiss stylistic evidence, we have seen that the matter is not that easy or simple. We have examined the problem of abridgment on the basis of available evidence, actual abridged texts, and we have seen that the stylistic variation of Q and F cannot be explained on the basis of abridgment.

If Q is not then derived from the Folio and is an independent text, it can no longer be regarded as a version of a play written by Shakespeare. As Albert Feuillerat demonstrates, there are clearly two hands present in Q, but there is no certain means of demonstrating the identity of the original author and the reviser. But that, after all, is a matter of minor importance in comparison with the very great change that is necessary in our view of Shakespeare's career. We must now reject the idea of Shakespeare, early in his career, writing popular original plays dealing with English history. The date of *2 Henry VI* is also rendered uncertain. Assuming that Q was a reported text, scholars could date *2 Henry VI* as being in

existence by 1594, the date of Q's entry and publication, but now we are on uncertain ground. Interpreting Greene's famous allusion to the "tyger's heart" as an allusion to Shakespeare's theft of an original play by Greene, we might incline to 1592 as the date of Shakespeare's revision, but argument still rages as to the proper meaning of Greene's reference, and there can be no agreement or certainty as matters now stand. There is, however, the reference to plays dealing with Henry VI "which oft our stage hath shown," in the epilogue of *Henry V*. Thus we can be reasonably sure that Shakespeare had revised the old plays by that time (1599?) and that they had been reasonably popular.

But whatever date we may assign, the important fact is that Shakespeare, like Ben Jonson and the other dramatists mentioned by Henslowe, did revise old plays written by other men. For some reason, possibly emotional, critics and scholars seem adamant in their opposition to this fact. I do not see that to admit revision of the type which we have seen is to denigrate genius or to question the integrity of Heminge and Condell. Shakespeare was a working playwright and actor who supplied plays for his company. If we are to judge by the activities of the Admiral's Men, Shakespeare's company probably presented around 30 different plays each season with roughly a third being new. Such a schedule demanded much more than one man could supply, so what is more natural than the use of old plays for revision into new ones? It is also apparent that the company must have employed one or probably more playwrights in addition to Shakespeare, but it is not until 1598 (*Everyman in His Humour*), that we have the name of anyone other than Shakespeare writing for the Chamberlain's Men. The need for rapid production of plays is a fact which we must not overlook. However much we may desire to isolate Shakespeare in a remote tower carefully penning immortal lines for posterity, the fact remains that he was in and of the theater, living in a world that demanded much and to which he gave his genius in the form of plays that were destined for acting by a profit-making organization.

Appendix

Parallel Passages Cited in the Text

Quarto, I.iii

My Lord of *Suffolke*, you may see by this,
The Commons loues vnto that haughtie Duke,
That seekes to him more then to King *Henry*:
Whose eyes are alwaies poring on his booke,
And nere regards the honour of his name,
But still must be protected like a childe,
And gouerned by that ambitious Duke,
That scarce will moue his cap nor speake to vs,
And his proud wife, high minded *Elanor*,
That ruffles it with such a troupe of Ladies,
As strangers in the Court takes her for the Queene.
The other day she vanted to her maides,
That the very traine of her worst gowne,
Was worth more wealth then all my fathers lands,
Can any griefe of minde be like to this.
I tell thee *Poull*, when thou didst runne at Tilt,
And stolst away our Ladaies hearts in *France*,
I thought King *Henry* had bene like to thee,
Or else thou hadst not brought me out of *France*.

Suffolke. Madame content your selfe a litle while,
As I was cause of your comming to England,
So will I in England worke your full content:
And as for proud Duke *Humphrey* and his wife,
I haue set lime-twigs that will intangle them,
As that your grace ere long shall vnderstand.
But staie Madame, here comes the King.

Folio, I.iii

My Lord of Suffolke, say, is this the guise?
 Is this the Fashions in the Court of England?
 Is this the Gouernment of Britaines Ile?
 And this the Royaltie of *Albions* King?
 What, shall King *Henry* be a Pupill still,
 Vnder the surly *Glosters* Gouernance?
 Am I a Queene in Title and in Stile,
 And must be made a Subiect to a Duke?
 I tell thee *Poole*, when in the Citie *Tours*
 Thou ran'st a-tilt in honor of my Loue,
 And stol'st away the Ladies hearts of France;
 I thought King *Henry* had resembled thee,
 In Courage, Courtship, and Proportion:
 But all his minde is bent to Holinesse,
 To number *Aue-Maries* on his Beades:
 His Champions, are the Prophets and Apostles,
 His Weapons, holy Sawes of sacred Writ,
 His Studie is his Tilt-yard, and his Loues
 Are brazen Images of Canonized Saints.
 I would the Colledge of the Cardinalls
 Would chuse him Pope, and carry him to Rome,
 And set the Triple Crowne vpon his Head;
 That were a State fit for his Holinesse.

Suff. Madame be patient: as I was cause
 Your Highnesse came to England, so will I
 In England worke your Graces full content.

Queene. Beside the haughtie Protector, haue we *Beauford*
 The imperious Churchman; *Somerset*, *Buckingham*,
 And grumbling *Yorke*: and not the least of these,
 But can doe more in England then the King.

Suff. And he of these, that can doe most of all,
 Cannot doe more in England then the *Neuils*:

Salisbury and *Warwick* are no simple Peeres.

Queene. Not all these Lords do vex me halfe so much,
 As that proud Dame, the Lord Protectors Wife:
 She sweepes it through the Court with troupes of Ladies,
 More like an Empresse, then Duke *Humphreyes* Wife?
 Strangers in Court, doe take her for the Queene:
 She beares a Dukes Reuenewes on her backe,
 And in her heart she scornes our Pouertie:
 Shall I not liue to be aueng'd on her?

Contemtuious base-borne Callot as she is,
She vaunted 'mongst her Minions t'other day,
The very trayne of her worst wearing Gowne,
Was better worth then all my Fathers Lands,
Till *Suffolke* gaue two Dukedomes for his Daughter.

Suff. Madame, my selfe haue lym'd a Bush for her,
And plac't a Quier of such enticing Birds,
That she will light to listen to the Layes,
And neuer mount to trouble you againe.
So let her rest: and Madame list to me,
For I am bold to counsaile you in this;
Although we fancie not the Cardinall,
Yet must we ioyne with him and with the Lords,
Till we haue brought Duke *Humphrey* in disgrace.
As for the Duke of Yorke, this late Complaint
Will make but little for his benefit:
So one by one wee'le weed them all at last,
And you your selfe shall steere the happy Helme. *Exit.*

Quarto, I.iv

Enter *Elnor*, with sir *Iohn Hum*, *Roger Bullenbrooke* a Coniurer,
and *Margery Iourdain*e a Witch.

Elnor. Here sir *Iohn*, take this scrole of paper here,
Wherein is writ the questions you shall aske,
And I will stand vpon this Tower here,
And here the spirit what it saies to you,
And to my questions, write the answeres downe.

She goes vp to the Tower.

Sir Iohn. Now sirs begin and cast your spels about,
And charme the fiendes for to obey your wils,
And tell Dame *Elnor* of the thing she askes.

Witch. Then *Roger Bullinbrooke* about thy taske,
And frame a Cirkle here vpon the earth,
Whilst I thereon all prostrate on my face,
Do talke and whisper with the diuels be low,
And coniure them for to obey my will.

She lies downe vpon her face.

Bullenbrooke makes a Cirkle.

Bullen. Darke Night, dread Night, the silence of the Night,
Wherein the Furies maske in hellish troupes,
Send vp I charge you from *Sosetus* lake,
The spirit *Askalon* to come to me,
To pierce the bowels of this Centricke earth,
And hither come in twinkling of an eye,
Askalon, Assenda, Assenda.

It thunders and lightens, and then the spirit riseth vp.

Spirit. Now *Bullenbrooke* what wouldst thou haue me do?

Bullen. First of the King, what shall become of him?

Spirit. The Duke yet liues that *Henry* shall depose,
But him out liue, and dye a violent death.

Bullen. What fate awayt the Duke of *Suffolke*.

Spirit. By water shall he die and take his ende.

Bullen. What shall betide the Duke of *Somerset*?

Spirit. Let him shun Castles, safer shall he be vpon the sandie plaines,
then where Castles mounted stand.

Now question me no more, for I must hence againe.

Folio, I.iv

Enter the Witch, the two Priests, and Bullingbrooke.

Hume. Come my Masters, the Duchesse I tell you expects performance of your promises.

Bulling. Master *Hume*, we are therefore provided: will her Ladyship behold and heare our Exorcismes?

Hume. I, what else? feare you not her courage.

Bulling. I haue heard her reported to be a Woman of an inuincible spirit: but it shall be conuenient, Master *Hume*, that you be by her aloft, while wee be busie below; and so I pray you goe in Gods Name, and leaue vs.

Exit Hume.

Mother *Iordan*, be you prostrate, and grouell on the Earth; *Iohn Southwell* reade you, and let vs to our worke.

Enter Elianor aloft.

Elianor. Well said my Masters, and welcome all: To this geere, the sooner the better.

Bullin. Patience, good Lady, Wizards know their times:
Deepe Night, darke Night, the silent of the Night,
The time of Night when Troy was set on fire,
The time when Screech-owles cry, and Bandogs howle,
And Spirits walke, and Ghosts breake vp their Graues;
That time best fits the worke we haue in hand.
Madame, sit you, and feare not: whom wee rayse,
Wee will make fast within a hallow'd Verge.

*Here doe the Ceremonies belonging, and make the Circle,
Bullingbrooke or Southwell reades, Coniuro
te, &c. It Thunders and Lightens
terribly: then the Spirit
riseth.*

Spirit. Ad sum.

Witch. Asmath, by the eternall God,
Whose name and power thou tremblest at,
Answer that I shall aske: for till thou speake,
Thou shalt not passe from hence.

Spirit. Aske what thou wilt; that I had sayd, and done.

Bulling. First of the King: What shall of him become?

Spirit. The Duke yet liues, that *Henry* shall depose:

He sinks downe againe.

Bullen. Then downe I say, vnto the damned poule.
Where Pluto in his frie Waggon sits.
Ryding amidst the singde and parched smoakes,
The Rode of *Dytas* by the Riuer Stykes,
There howle and burne for euer in those flames,
Rise *lordaine* rise, and staie thy charming Spels.
Sonnes, we are betraide.

Enter the Duke of *Yorke*, and the Duke of *Buckingham*, and others.

Yorke. Come sirs, laie hands on them, and bind them sure,
This time was well watcht. What Madame are you there?
This will be great credit for your husband,
That your are plotting Treasons thus with Cuniurers,
The King shall haue notice of this thing.

Exet Elnor aboue.

Buc. See here my Lord what the diuell hath writ.

Yorke. Giue it me my Lord, Ile show it to the King.
Go sirs, see them fast lockt in prison.

Exet with them.

Bucking. My Lord, I pray you let me go post vnto the King,
Vnto S. Albones, to tell this newes.

Yorke. Content. Away then, about it straight.

Buck. Farewell my Lord.

Exet Buckingham.

Yorke. Whose within there?

Enter one.

One. My Lord.

Yorke. Sirrha, go will the Earles of Salsbury and Warwicke, to sup
with me to night.

Exet *Yorke.*

One. I will my Lord.

Exet.

But him out-liue, and dye a violent death.

Bulling. What fates await the Duke of Suffolke?

Spirit. By Water shall he dye, and take his end.

Bulling. What shall befall the Duke of Somerset?

Spirit. Let him shun Castles,

Safer shall he be vpon the sandie Plaines,

Then where Castles mounted stand.

Haue done, for more I hardly can endure.

Bulling. Discend to Darknesse, and the burning Lake: False Fiend auoide.

Thunder and Lightning. Exit Spirit.

Enter the Duke of Yorke and the Duke of Buckingham with their Guard, and breake in.

Yorke. Lay hands vpon these Traytors, and their trash:

Beldam I thinke we watcht you at an ynch.

What Madame, are you there? the King & Commonweale

Are deeply indebted for this peece of paines;

My Lord Protector will, I doubt it not,

See you well guerdon'd for these good deserts.

Elleanor. Not halfe so bad as thine to Englands King,

Iniurious Duke, that threatest where's no cause.

Buck. True Madame, none at all: what call you this?

Away with them, let them be clapt vp close,

And kept asunder: you Madame shall with vs.

Stafford take her to thee.

Wee'le see you Trinkets here all forth-comming.

All away.

Exit.

Yorke. Lord *Buckingham*, me thinks you watcht her well:

A pretty Plot, well chosen to build vpon.

Now pray my Lord, let's see the Deuils Writ.

What haue we here?

Reades.

The Duke yet liues, that Henry shall depose:

But him out-liue, and dye a violent death.

Why this is iust, *Aio Æacida Romanos vincere posso.*

Well, to the rest:

Tell me what fate awaits the Duke of Suffolke?

By Water shall he dye, and take his end.

What shall betide the Duke of Somerset?

Let him shunne Castles,

Safer shall he be vpon the sandie Plaines,

Then where Castles mounted stand.

Come, come, my Lords,

These Oracles are hardly attain'd,
And hardly vnderstood.

• The King is now in progresse towards Saint *Albones*,
With him, the Husband of this louely Lady:
Thither goes these Newes,
As fast as Horse can carry them:
A sorry Breakfast for my Lord Protector.

Buck. Your Grace shal giue me leaue, my Lord of York,
To be the Poste, in hope of his reward.

Yorke. At your pleasure, my good Lord.
Who's within there, hoe?

Enter a Seruingman.

Inuite my Lords of Salisbury and Warwick
To suppe with me to morrow Night. Away.

Exeunt.

Quarto, III.i

King. I wonder our vnkle Gloster staies so long.

Queene. Can you not see, or will you not perceiue,
How that ambitious Duke doth vse himselfe?
The time hath bene, but now that time is past,
That none so humble as Duke Humphrey was:
But now let one meete him euen in the morne,
When euery one will giue the time of day,
And he will neither moue nor speake to vs.
See you not how the Commons follow him
In troupes, crying, God saue the good Duke Humphrey,
And with long life, Iesus preserue his grace,
Honouring him as if he were their King.
Gloster is no litle man in England,
And if he list to stir commotions,
Tys likely that the people will follow him.
My Lord, if you imagine there is no such thing,
Then let it passe, and call it a womans feare.
My Lord of Suffolke, Buckingham, and Yorke,
Disproue my Alligations if you can,
And by your speeches, if you can reprove me,
I will subscribe and say, I wrong'd the Duke.

Folio, III.ii

Noyse within. Enter Warwicke, and many Commons.

War. It is reported, mighty Soueraigne,
That good Duke *Humfrey* Traiterously is mured
By Suffolke, and the Cardinall *Beaufords* meanes:
The Commons like an angry Hiue of Bees
That want their Leader, scatter vp and downe,
And care not who they sting in his reuenge.
My selfe haue calmd their spleenfull mutinie,
Vntil they heare the order of his death.

King. That he is dead good Warwick, 'tis too true,
But how he dyed, God knowes, not *Henry*:
Enter his Chamber, view his breathlesse Corpes,
And comment then vpon his sodaine death.

War. That shall I do my Liege; Stay Salsburie
With the rude multitude, till I returne.

King. O thou that iudgeth all things, stay my thoghts:
My thoughts, that labour to perswade my soule,
Some violent hands were laid on *Humfries* life:
If my suspect be false, forgiue me God,
For iudgement onely doth belong to thee:
Faine would I go to chase his palie lips,
With twenty thousand kisses, and to draine
Vpon his face an Ocean of salt teares,
To tell my loue vnto his dumbe deafe trunkes,
And with my fingers feele his hand, vnfeeling:
But all in vaine are these meane Obsequies,

Bed put forth.

And to suruey his dead and earthy Image:
What were it but to make my sorrow greater?

Warw. Come hither gracious Soueraigne, view this body.

King. That is to see how deepe my graue is made,
For with his soule fled all my worldly solace:
For seeing him, I see my life in death.

Quarto, I V.i

Alarmes within, and the chambers be discharged, like as it were a fight at sea. And then enter the Capitaine of the ship and the Maister, and the Maisters Mate, & the Duke of Suffolke disguised, and others with him, and Water Whickmore.

Cap. Bring forward these prisoners that scorn'd to yeeld,
Vnlade their goods with speed and sincke their ship,
Here Maister, this prisoner I giue to you.
This other, the Maisters Mate shall haue,
And Water Whickmore thou shalt haue this man,
And let them paie their ransomes ere they passe.

Suffolke. Water! *He starteth.*

Water. How now, what doest feare me?
Thou shalt haue better cause anon.

Suf. It is thy name affrights me, not thy selfe.
I do remember well, a cunning Wyssard told me,
That by Water I should die:
Yet let not that make thee bloudie minded.
Thy name being rightly sounded,
Is Gualter, not Water.

Water. Gualter or Water, als one to me,
I am the man must bring thee to thy death.

Suf. I am a Gentleman looke on my Ring,
Ransome me at what thou wilt, it shalbe paid.

Water. I lost mine eye in boording of the ship,
And therefore I marchantlike sell blood for gold,
Then cast me headlong downe into the sea.

2. *Priso.* But what shall our ransomes be?

Mai. A hundreth pounds a piece, either paie that or die.

2. *Priso.* Then saue our liues, it shall be paid.

Water. Come sirrha, thy life shall be the ransome
I will haue.

Suff. Staie villaine, thy prisoner is a Prince,
The Duke of Suffolke, William de la Poull.

Cap. The Duke of Suffolke folded vp in rags.

Suf. I sir, but these rags are no part of the Duke,
Ioue sometime went disguisde, and why not I?

Cap. I but Ioue was neuer slaine as thou shalt be.

Suf. Base ladie groome, King Henries blood
The honourable blood of Lancaster,
Cannot be shead by such a lowly swaine,

Folio, IV.i

Alarum. Fight at Sea. Ordnance goes off.

Enter Lieutenant, Suffolke, and others.

Lieu. The gaudy blabbing and remorsefull day,
Is crept into the bosome of the Sea:
And now loud houlings Wolues arouse the lades
That dragge the Tragicke melancholy night:
Who with their drowsie, slow, and flagging wings
Cleape dead-mens graues, and from their misty lawes,
Breath foule contagious darknesse in the ayre:
Therefore bring forth the Souldiers of our prize,
For whilst our Pinnace Anchors in the Downes,
Heere shall they make theit ransome on the sand,
Or with their blood staine this discoloured shore.
Maister, this Prisoner freely giue I thee,
And thou that art his Mate, make boote of this:
The other *Walter Whitmore* is thy share.

1. *Gent.* What is my ransome Master, let me know.

Ma. A thousand Crownes, or else lay down your head

Mate. And so much shall you giue, or off goes yours.

Lieu. What thinke you much to pay 2000. Crownes,
And beare the name and port of Gentlemen?
Cut both the Villaines throats, for dy you shall:
The liues of those which we haue lost in fight,
Be counter-poyts'd with such a pettie summe.

1. *Gent.* Ile giue it sir, and therefore spare my life.

2. *Gent.* And so will I, and write home for it straight.

Whitm. I lost mine eye in laying the prize aboard,
And therefore to reuenge it, shalt thou dye,
And so should these, if I might haue my will.

Lieu. Be not so rash, take ransome, let him liue.

Suf. Looke on my George, I am a Gentleman,
Rate me at what thou wilt, thou shalt be payed.

Whit. And so am I: my name is *Walter Whitmore*.
How now? why starts thou? What doth death affright?

Suf. Thy name affrights me, in whose sound is death:
A cunning man did calculate my birth,
And told me that by Water I should dye:
Yet let not this make thee be bloody-minded,
Thy name is *Gualtier*, being rightly sounded.

Whit. *Gualtier* or *Walter*, which it is I care not,
Neuer yet did base dishonour blurre our name,

I am sent Ambassador for the Queene to France,
I charge thee waffe me crosse the channell safe.

Cap. Ile waffe thee to thy death, go Water take him hence,
And on our long boates side, chop off his head.

Suf. Thou darste not for thine owne.

Cap. Yes Poull.

Suffolke. Poull.

Cap. I Poull, puddle, kennell, sinke and durt,
Ile stop that yawning mouth of thine,
Those lips of thine that so oft haue kist the
Queene, shall sweepe the ground, and thou that
Smildste at good Duke Humphreys death,
Shalt liue no longer to infect the earth.

Suffolke. This villain being but Captain of a Pinnais,
Threatens more plagues then mightie Abradas,
The great Masadonian Pyrate,
Thy words addes fury and not remorse in me.

Cap. I but my deeds shall staie thy fury soone.

Suffolke. Hast not thou waited at my Trencher,
When we haue feasted with Queene Margret?
Hast not thou kist thy hand and held my stirrope?
And barehead plodded by my footecloth Mule,
And thought thee happie when I smilde on thee?
This hand hath writ in thy defence,
Then shall I charme thee, hold thy lauish toong.

Cap. Away with him Water, I say, and off with his hed.

1. *Priso.* Good my Lord, intreat him mildly for your life.

Suffolke. First let this necke stoupe to the axes edge,
Before this knee do bow to any,
Saue to the God of heauen and to my King:
Suffolkes imperiall toong cannot pleade
To such a ladie groome.

Water. Come, come, why do we let him speake,
I long to haue his head for raunsome of mine eye.

Suffolke. A Swordar and bandeto slaue,
Murthered sweete Tully.

Brutus bastard-hand stabde Iulius Cæsar,
And Suffolke dies by Pyrates on the seas.

Exet Suffolke, and Water.

Cap. Off with his head, and send it to the Queene,
And ransomelesse this prisoner shall go free,
To see it safe deliuered vnto her.

Come lets goe.

Exet omnes.

But with our sword we wip'd away the blot.
Therefore, when Merchant-like I sell reuenge,
Broke be my sword, my Armes torne and defac'd,
And I proclaim'd a Coward through the world.

Suf. Stay *Whitmore*, for thy Prisoner is a Prince,
The Duke of Suffolke, *William de la Pole*.

Whit. The Duke of Suffolke, muffled vp in ragges?

Suf. I, but these ragges are no part of the Duke.

Lieu. But Ioue was neuer slaine as thou shalt be,
Obscure and lowsie Swaine, King *Henries* blood.

Suf. The honourable blood of Lancaster
Must not be shed by such a iaded Groome:
Hast thou not kist thy hand, and held my stirrop?
Bare-headed plodded by my foot-cloth Mule,
And thought thee happy when I shooke my head.
How often hast thou waited at my cup,
Fed from my Trencher, kneel'd downe at the boord,
When I haue feasted with Queene *Margaret*?
Remember it, and let it make thee Crest-falne,
I, and alay this thy abortiue Pride:

How in our voyding Lobby hast thou stood,
And duly wayted for my comming forth?
This hand of mine hath writ in thy behalfe,
And therefore shall it charme thy riotous tongue.

Whit. Speak Captaine, shall I stab the forlorn Swain.

Lieu. First let my words stab him, as he hath me.

Suf. Base slaue, thy words are blunt, and so art thou.

Lieu. Conuey him hence, and on our long boats side,
Strike off his head. *Suf.* Thou dar'st not for thy owne.

Lieu. *Poole*, Sir *Poole*? Lord,
I kennell, puddle, sinke, whose filth and dirt
Troubles the siluer Spring, where England drinks:
Now will I dam vp thy yawning mouth,
For swallowing the Treasure of the Realme.
Thy lips that kist the Queene, shall sweepe the ground:
And thou that smil'dst at good Duke *Humfries* death,
Against the senselesse windes shall grin in vaine,
Who in contempt shall hisse at thee againe.
And wedded be thou to the Haggas of hell,
For daring to affye a mighty Lord
Vnto the daughter of a worthlesse King,
Hauing neyther Subiect, Wealth, nor Diadem:
By diuellish policy art thou growne great,
And like ambitious Sylla ouer-gorg'd,

With gobbets of thy Mother-bleeding heart.
 By thee *Aniou* and *Maine* were sold to France.
 The false reuolting Normans thorough thee,
 Disdaine to call vs Lord, and *Piccardie*
 Hath slaine their Gouvernors, surpriz'd our Forts,
 And sent the ragged Souldiers wounded home.
 The Princely Warwicke, and the *Neuils* all,
 Whose dreadfull swords were neuer drawne in vaine,
 As hating thee, and rising vp in armes.
 And now the House of Yorke thrust from the Crowne,
 By shamefull murder of a guiltlesse King,
 And lofty proud incroaching tyranny,
 Burnes with reuenging fire, whose hopefull colours
 Aduance our halfe-fac'd Sunne, striuing to shine;
 Vnder the which is writ, *Inuitis nubibus*.
 The Commons heere in Kent are vp in armes,
 And to conclude, Reproach and Beggerie,
 Is crept into the Pallace of our King,
 And all by thee: away, conuey him hence.

Suf. O that I were a God, to shoot forth Thunder
 Vpon these paltry, seruile, abiect Drudges:
 Small things make base men proud. This Villaine heere,
 Being Captaine of a Pinnace, threatens more
 Then *Bargulus* the strong Illyrian Pyrate.
 Drones sucke not Eagles blood, but rob Bee-hiues:
 It is impossible that I should dye
 By such a lowly Vassall as thy selfe.
 Thy words moue Rage, and not remorse in me:
 I go of Message from the Queene to France:
 I charge thee waft me safely crosse the Channell.

Lieu. Water: W. Come Suffolke, I must waft thee to thy death.

Suf. *Pine gelidus timor occupat artus*, it is thee I feare.

Wal. Thou shalt haue cause to feare before I leaue thee.

What, are ye danted now? Now will ye stoope.

1. *Gent.* My gracious Lord intreat him, speak him fair.

Suf. Suffolkes Imperiall tongue is sterne and rough:

Vs'd to command, vntaught to pleade for fauour.

Farre be it, we should honor such as these

With humble suite: no, rather let my head

Stoope to the blocke, then these knees bow to any,

Saue to the God of heauen, and to my King:

And sooner dance vpon a bloody pole,

Then stand vncouer'd to the Vulgar Groome.

True Nobility, is exempt from feare:

More can I beare, then you dare execute.

Lieu. Hale him away, and let him talke no more:
Come Souldiers, shew what cruelty ye can.

Suf. That this my death may neuer be forgot.

Great men oft dye by vilde Bezonions.

A Romane Sworder, and Bandetto slaue

Murder'd sweet *Tully*. *Bruton* Bastard hand

Stab'd *Iulius Cæsar*. Sauage Islanders

Pompey the Great, and *Suffolke* dyes by Pyrats.

Exit Water with Suffolke.

Lieu. And as for these whose ransome we haue set,
It is our pleasure one of them depart:

Therefore come you with vs, and let him go.

Exit Lieutenant, and the rest.

Manet the first Gent. Enter Water with the body.

Wal. There let his head, and liuelesse bodie lye,
Vntill the Queene his Mistris bury it. *Exit Walter.*

1. *Gent.* O barbarous and bloudy spectacle,
His body will I beare vnto the King:
If he reuenge it not, yet will his Friends,
So will the Queene, that liuing, held him deere.

Quarto, IV.iv

Enter the King reading of a Letter, and the Queene, with the Duke of *Suffolkes* head, and the Lord *Say*, with others.

King. Sir *Humphrey Stafford* and his brother is slaine,
And the Rebels march amaine to London,
Go back to them, and tell them thus from me,
Ile come and parley with their generall.

Reade. Yet staie, ile reade the Letter one againe.
Lord *Say*, lacke *Cade* hath solemnely vowde to haue thy head.

Say. I, but I hope your highnesse shall haue his.

King. How now Madam, still lamenting and mourning for *Suffolkes* death, I feare my loue, if I had bene dead, thou wouldst not haue mournde so much for me.

Queene. No my loue, I should not mourne, but die for thee.

Enter a Messenger.

Messen. Oh flie my Lord, the Rebels are entered
Southwarke, and haue almost wonne the Bridge,
Calling your grace an vsurper,
And that monstrous Rebelle *Cade*, hath sworne
To Crowne himselfe King in *Westminster*,
Therefore flie my Lord, and poste to *Killingworth*.

King. Go bid *Buckingham* and *Clifford*, gather
An Army vp, and meete with the Rebels.
Come Madame, let vs haste to *Killingworth*.
Come on Lord *Say*, go thou along with vs,
For feare the Rebelle *Cade* do finde thee out.

Say. My innocence my Lord shall pleade for me.
And therfore with your highnesse leaue, ile staie behind.

King. Euen as thou wilt my Lord *Say*.
Come Madame, let vs go.

Exet omnes.

Folio, IV.iv

Enter the King with a Supplication, and the Queene with Suffolkes head, the Duke of Buckingham, and the Lord Say.

Queene. Oft haue I heard that greefe softens the mind,
And makes it fearefull and degenerate,
Thinke therefore on reuenge, and cease to weepe.
But who can cease to weepe, and looke on this.
Heere may his head lye on my throbbing brest:
But where's the body that I should imbrace?

Buc. What answer makes your Grace to the Rebells
Supplication?

King. Ile send some holy Bishop to intreat:
For God forbid, so many simple soules
Should perish by the Sword. And I my selfe,
Rather then bloody Warre shall cut them short,
Will parley with *Iacke Cade* their Generall.
But stay, Ile read it ouer once againe.

Qu. Ah barbarous villaines: Hath this louely face,
Rul'd like a wandering Plannet ouer me,
And could it not inforce them to relent,
That were vnworthy to behold the same.

King. Lord *Say*, *Iacke Cade* hath sworne to haue thy head.

Say. I, but I hope your Highnesse shall haue his.

King. How now Madam?
Still lamenting and mourning for Suffolkes death?
I feare me (*Loue*) if that I had beene dead,
Thou would'st not haue mourn'd so much for me.

Qu. No my *Loue*, I should not mourne, but dye for thee.

Enter a Messenger.

King. How now? What newes? Why com'st thou in such haste?

Mes. The Rebels are in Southwatke: Fly my Lord:
Iacke Cade proclaimes himselfe Lord *Mortimer*,
Descended from the Duke of *Clarence* house,
And calles your Grace *Vsurper*, openly,
And vowes to Crowne himselfe in Westminster.
His Army is a ragged multitude
Of Hindes and Pezants, rude and mercilesse:
Sir *Humfrey Stafford*, and his Brothers death,
Hath giuen them heart and courage to proceede:
All Schollers, Lawyers, Courtiers, Gentlemen,
They call false Catterpillers, and intend their death.

Kin. Oh gracelesse men: they know not what they do.

Buck. My gracious Lord, retire to Killingworth,
Vntill a power be rais'd to put them downe.

Qu. Ah were the Duke of Suffolke now aliue,
These Kentish Rebels would be soone appeas'd.

King. Lord *Say*, the Traitors hateth thee,
Therefore away with vs to Killingworth.

Say. So might your Graces person be in danger:
The sight of me is odious in their eyes:
And therefore in this Citty will I stay,
And liue alone as secret as I may.

Enter another Messenger.

Mess. lacke Cade hath gotten London-bridge.
The Citizens flye and forsake their houses:
The Rascall people, thirsting after prey,
Ioyne with the Traitor, and they ioyntly sweare
To spoyle the City, and your Royall Court.

Buc. Then linger not my Lord, away, take horse.

King. Come *Margaret*, God our hope will succor vs.

Qu. My hope is gone, now Suffolke is deceast.

King. Farewell my Lord, trust not the Kentish Rebels

Buc. Trust no body for feare you betraid.

Say. The trust I haue, is in mine innocence,
And therefore am I bold and resolute. *Exeunt.*

The Book of Sir Thomas More

ORIGINAL TEXT

(THIS) MUST BENEWE A table beeing couered with a greene Carpet, a state Cushion on it,
(WRITT)EN and the Pursse and Mace lying thereon Enter Sir Thomas Moore and
his man Randall with him, attyred like him.

Moore. Come on Sir, are you readie?

Ran. yes my Lord, I stand but vppon a fewe pointes, I shall haue doone presently,
Is it your honors pleasure that I should [be] growe proude now? *740

Moore. I, I must haue thee proude, or else thou'lt nere
be neere allyed to greatnesse: obserue me Sir.
The learned Clarke *Erasmus* is arriu'de
within our Englishe Courte, this day I heare,
he feasteth with an Englishe honourd Poett
the Earle of Surrey, and I knowe this night
the famous Clarke of *Roterdame* will visite
Sir Thomas Moore, therfore Sir, act my parte,
there, take my place furnishte with pursse and Mace.
He see if great *Erasmus* can distiguish
merit and outward ceremonie: obserue me Sirra, *750
He be thy glasse, dresse thy behauiour
according to my carlage, but beware
thou talke not ouermuch, for twill betray thee.
who prates not oft, seemes wise, his witt fewe scan,
whilste the tounge blabs tales of th'imperfect man.

Ran. I conceiue your Lordship, and haue learnde your shift so well, that I must needes
be apprehensiue[]. The waites playcs within

Moore. This Musique telles vs, that the Earle is come
with learnde *Erasmus*. Now my Lord Chauncellour, *760
Act like a formall Player our graue parte.

Ran. I pray ye my Lord, let me comaund ye to leaue me, if I doo it not in kew, let
your Lordship bannishe me from the wearing of a golde chaine for euer.

Moore. They come now, set thy countenance, act thy parte
with a firme boldnesse, and thou winnest my hart. ——— *exit*

Musique, enter *Surrey*, *Erasmus* and attendants.
Sur. Now great *Erasmus*, you approche the presence,
of a moste learned woorthie Gentleman.

This little He holdes not a truer freend
vnto the Artes: nor dooth his greatnesse add
a feigned florishe to his woorthie meritt. *770
Hees great in studie, thats the statists grace,
that gaines more reuerence then the outward place.

Eras. Reporte my Lord hath crost the narrow Seas,
and to the seuerall partes of Christendome

The Book of Sir Thomas More

REVISION

Enter S^r Thomas moore and his man Atired like him

FOL. 12^a

Moore. Com on sir are yo^a redy

Randall. yes my Lord I stand but one a few points. I shall have donn p^sentlie. before god I have practised yo^r Lordshipps shift so well. that I thinke I shall grow prowde my Lord

Moore. tis fitt thou shouldst wax prowde. or ells thoult nere be neere allied to greatnes. observe me Sirra the Learned Clarke Erasmus is arived wthin o^r english court. Last night I heere he feasted wth o^r honord English poet the Earle of Surrey. and I learnd to day the famous clarke of Rotherdam will visett S^r Thomas moore, therefore sir take my seate yo^a are Lord Chauncelor. dress yo^r behaviour according to my carriage but beware yo^a talke not over much for twill betray thee who prates not much seemes wise his witt few scan while the [tog] tongue Blabs tales of the Imperfitt man. Ile see If greate Erasmus can distinguishe merit and outward Cerimony

10

Rand. If I doe not deserve a share for playing of yo^r Lo. well. lett me be yeoman vsher to yo^r Sumpter and be banisht from wearing of a gold chaine for ever

20

Moore. well sir Ile hide o^r motion act my part wth a firme Boldnes and thou winst my hart how now whats the matter.

*Enter The Shreive wth
Fawkenr a ruffin
and officers*

Faulk. Tugg me not Ime noe beare. sbloud If all the doggs in paris garden. hung at my tale. Ide shake em of wth this. that Ile appeere. before noe king Cirstned but my good Lord Chauncelor

Shre. weele cristen yo^a sirra. bring him forward.

Moore how now what tumults make yo^a

30

ffall. the azurd heavens protect my noble Lord chauncelor

Moore. what fellowes this.

Shre. A Ruffian my Lord that hath sett half the Cittie in an vpprore

Falk. my Lord.

Shre. ther was a fray in paternoster row. and because they would not be p^ted. the street was choakt vpp wth carts.

fauk. my noble Lord panier Alliees throat was open.

Moore S^a hold yo^r peace

fauk Ile prove the street was not choakt. but is as well as ever it was since It was

- hath borne the fame of your Lord Chauncellour.
 I longd to see him, whom with loouing thoughts
 I in my studie oft haue visited.
Is yond Sir Thomas?
- Sur.* It is *Erasmus*. *780
 Now doo you viewe the honorablest Scholler,
 the moste religious Politician,
 the woorthiest Councellour that tends our state.
 That Studie is the generall watche of England,
 In it, the Princes safetie, and the peace,
 that shines vppon our cõmon weale, [is] are forge.
 vppon the golden Anuile of his braine.
 who cures the Realme, such care attends the great,
 that minde and bodie must together sweate.
- Eras.* His Lordship hath some weightie busines sure, *790
 for see, as yet he takes no notice of vs.
 I thinke twere best I doo my dutie to him
 in a short Latine speeche.
- Sur.* It will doo well,
 hees the best linguist that we haue in England.
) *Cum tua virtus, (amplissim))doctissime que vir) (*
[Here one or more original leaves are lost.]
- Methinkes this straunge and Ruffinlike disguise,
 fits not the follower of a secretarie. FOL. 14^a
- Faulk.* My Lord, I weare my haire vppon a vow.
Shrew. But for no penaunce of your sinnes I feare. †800
- Sur.* No, hees no haire-cloth man, though he weare haire.
Moore. ffaulkener, how long ist since you cutt your locks?
Faulk. Three yeares my Lord.
Moore. How long wilt be before your vow expire?
Faulk. As many yeares as since my haire was cut.
Moore. Sure, vowes are holy things, if they be made
 to good intent, and Sir, you shall not say,
 you were compelde by me to breake your vowe.
 But till the expiration of the same,
 because I will not haue ye walke the streetes, †810
 for euery man to stand and wunder at,
 I will cõmitt ye prisoner vnto Newgate.
 Except meane time, your conscience giue you leaue,
 to dispense with the long vow that you haue made
 Away with him.
- Sur.* A Cell moste meete for such a votarie.
Faulk. well Sir, and I may perhaps be bailde er't be long, and yet weare my haire(
Moore. And M^r. Sheriff of London, _____ they lead him out:
 heere in his highnesse name we giue you charge,
 continuall watche be kept through out the cittie, †820
 for the suppressing of these mutinies.
 And if heerafter any that belong,
 either to my Lord of winchester or Elle,
 doo come into your Cittie with a weapon,
 or aboue two of either faction,
 shall be scene walking in the streetes together

A streete

40

Shreu. this fellow was a principall broacher of the broile*fauk.* Sbloud I bro[]cht none. It was broacht and half ron[n] out before I had a lick at it*Shre.* and would be brought before noe Iustice but yo^r honor*Fauk.* I am haild my noble Lord*Moore.* no eare to choose for every triviall noice

but mine. and in so full a time. away

yo^a wronge me m^r shreve. dispose of himat yo^r owne plesure. send the knave to newgate*Fauk.* [sbloud] to newgate sbloud S^r Thomas moore. I appeale I appeale? from newgate to any of the two worshippfull counters

50

Moore. fellow whose man are yo^a that are thus lustie*Fauk.* my names Iack faukner. I serve next vnder god and my prince m^r morris secretary to my Lord of winchester*Moore.* A fellow of yo^r haire is very fitt. to be a secretaries follower*Fauk.* I hope so my Lord, the fray was betweene the Bishoppes men of Eelie and winchester. and I could not in honor but pte them. I thought it stood not wth my reputation and degree. to com to my Questions and aunswers. befor A a Citty Iustice. I knew I should to the pott*Moore.* thou hast byn ther It seemes to late all redie[FOL. 12^b]*Fauk.* I know yo^r honor is wise, and so forth. and I desire to be only [ch] cattachizd or examind by yo^a my noble Lord chauncelor*Moore.* Sirra. sirra you are a busie dangerous ruffian.

63

Fauk. Ruffian.*Moore.* how long have yo^a worne this haire*Fauk.* I have worne this haire ever since I was borne*Moore.* you know thats not my Question. but how long hath this shagg fleece hu[n]g dangling on thy head*Fauke.* how long my Lord. why sometimes thus Long sometimes Lowere as the fates & humors please.

70

Moore. So Quick sir wth me. ha? I see good fellow. thou lovest plaine dealing. sirra tell me now. when [whe] were yo^a last at Barbars. how longe time have yo^a vppon yo^r head woorne this shagg haire*Fauke.* My Lord Iack faukner tells noe Esops fabls. troth I was not at Barbars this three yeires. I have not byn Cutt nor will not be cutt. vppon a foolish vow. w^{ch} as the destanies shall direct I am sworne to keepe*Moore.* when comes that vow out*Fauk.* why when the humors are purgd not this three years*Moore.* voves are recorded in the court of heaven.

for they are holly acts. yong man I charge thee

and doe advize thee start not from y^r vow

and for I will be sure thou shalt not shreve

besids because It is an odious sight

to see a man thus hairie. thou shalt lie

In Newgate till thy vow and thy three years

be full expired. Away wth him

80

Fauke. my Lord*Moore.* Cut of this fleece and lie ther but a moneth*Fauke.* Ile not loose a haire to be Lord Chauncelor of Europe*Moore.* to newgate then. Sirra great sinns are Brede

90

or meete in Tauerne or in Ordinarie,
they be cōmitted presently to prison.

Sur. And cause to be proclaimd about the Cittie,
that no man whatsoeuer, that belongs,
either to my Lord of winchester or Elie,
doo walke without the liuerie of his Lord,
either in cloke or any other garment,
that notice may be taken of th'offenders.

†830

Enter Mr. Morris.

& *ex.* Sheriff and the rest.

Moris. God saue your honor my Lord Chauncellour.

Moor. welcome M^r Morris, what newes Sir?

Moris. I come moste humbly to entreate your honor,
in the behalfe of a poore man of mine.

Moore. what, the votarie, that will not cut his haire,
vntill the expiration of his vow?

†840

Moris. My lord, beeing sorie for his rude behauiour,
he hath cut his haire, and dooth conforme him selfe
[to honest decencie] in his attire.

Moore. where is the fellow? I am glad to heare it.

Moris. heere my good Lord.

Faukener is brought

Moore. you mock me surely, this is not the man.

Faulk. yes indeed my Lord, I am he.

Moore. Thou art not sure.

the other was an vglie filthie knaue,
thou, a good featurde and well fauourd man.
why see what monsters you will make your selues,
by cherishing a lothsome excrement,
t'abuse the goodly ymage of a man,
whom God did frame so excellent a creature.
well, be a peaceable and ciuill man,
I doo discharde thee.

†850

Faulk. I humbly thanke your honor.

Moris. And my selfe

[shall rest moste] thankfull for this gracious fauour.

Moore. wilt please your honors now to keepe your way:

†860

I feare the Lordes are hindered by our stay.

—— *exeunt* Lordcs.

Moris. See Sir what your Ruffian tricks come too,
you thinke the eye of wisdom doo's not see,
into the brainsick follies of vaine heades,
but with your swaggering, you can bear't away.

Faulk. Sir, I confesse I haue bin much misgouernde,
and led by ydle spleenes, which now I see,
are like them selues, meere sottishe vanitie.
when () the Tayle I better () lde to minde
the graue rebukes of my Lord Chauncell()
and lookte into my selfe with more res()
then my rashe heate before would let m()
I caused a Barber presently be sent f()
and mou'de your woorship then () for me.
but when I fall into ()
casheere me ()
()

†870

in all that Body wher thers a foule head. away wth him. exeunt

Enter Surry Erasmus and Attendants.

Surry. now great Erasmus you approch the p'sence
of a most worthy Learned gentleman.
this Little Ile holds not a trewer frend
vnto the arts. nor doth his greatnes add
A fained florish to his worthie pts
hees great in studie thats the statists grace
that gaines more Reverence then the outward place.

Erasmus. [It is Erasmus] Report my Lord hath Crost the narrow seas

100

and to the severall pts of Christendom
hath borne the same of yo^r Lord chauncelor
I long to see him whom wth loving thoughts
I in my studie oft have visited
Is that S^r Thomas moore

Surry. It is Erasmus

now shall yoⁿ vew the honorablest scholler
the most religious pollititian.
the worthiest Counsailor that tends o^r state
that study is the generall watch of England
In it the princes saftie and the [state] peace
that shines vppon o^r Comon wealth are forgd
by Loiall Industrie

110

Erasmus. I dowt him not

to be as nere the lif of Excellence
as you proclaime him when his meanest servaunts
are of some waight you saw my lord his porter
give entertainment to vs at the gate
in Latten. good phrase. whats the m^r then.
when such good pts shine in his meanest men.

120

Surry. his Lo hath som waightie Busines

for see as yett he takes noe notice of vs

FOL. 13^a

Erasmus. I thinke twere best I did my dutie to him

in a short Latin speech. *Qui in Celiberima[] patria natus est et
Gloriosa[] plus habet negotij et in [funem] Lucem veniat quam qui*

Rand. I pry thee good Erasmus be Covered. I have for sworne speaking of latten
as I am true Counsailor Ide tickle yoⁿ wth a speech. nay Sitt Erasmus. sitt
good my Lord of Surry. Ile make my Lady Com to yoⁿ annon If she will
and give yoⁿ entertainment

Erasmus. Is this S^r Thomas Moore

130

Surry. oh good Erasmus yoⁿ must Conceave his vaine hees ever furnisht wth thes
Conceits

Rand. yes faith my learned poet doth not lie for that matter. I am nether more
Enter s^r Thomas
moore. nor less then mery S^r Thomas allwaies. wilt supp wth me. by god I love
a parlous wise fellow that smells of a pollititian. better then a long progress

Surry. we are deluded. this is not his Lordship

Rand. I pray yoⁿ Erasmus how longe will the holland cheese in yo^r [Coſteyrie] Countrie
keepe w^{thout} maggetts.

Moore. foole painted Barbarisme retire thy self
Into thy first creation thus yo^e see
my loving learned frends how far respecte

140

waites often on the Cerimonious traine
 of bace Illitterate welth whilst men of schooles
 shrowded in povertie are cownted fooles
 pdon thou reverent germaine I have mixt
 so slight a Iest to the faire Entertainment
 of thy most worthy self. for know Erasmus
 mirth wrinckls vpp my face and I still Crave
 When that forsaks me I may [have] hugg my grave

Erasmus. yo^r honors mery humor is best phisick
 vnto yo^r able Boddy. for we learne
 wher mellancholly choaks the passages
 of bloud and breth the erreected spirit still
 lengthens o^r dayes wth sportfull exercise
 studie should be the saddest time of lif
 the rest a sport exempt from thought of strife

*et tu Erasmus an
 Diabolus*

150

Moore. *Erasmus* preacheth gospell against phisicke.
 my noble poet

Surry. oh my [noble] Lord yo^a tax me
 in that word poet of much Idlenes
 It is a studie that maks poore o^r fate
 poets were ever thought vnfit for state

160

Moore. o give not vp faire poisie sweet Lord
 to such Contempt. that I may speake my hart
 It is the sweetest heraldrie of art
 that setts a difference tweene the tough sharpe holly
 and tender Bay tree

Surry yett my lord. It is become the very Lagg in number
 to all mechanick sciences

Moore. why Ile show the reason
 this is noe age for poets they should sing
 to the lowd Canon *Heroica facta*
qui faciunt reges heroica Carmina lawdant
 and as great subiects of ther pen decay
 even so vnphisickt they doe melt away
 Com will yo^r Lordshipp in? my deere Erasmus
 Ile heere yo^a m^r moris presentlie.

Enter m^r Morris

170

my Lord I make yo^a m^r of my howse
 weelee Banquett heere wth fresh and staid delights
 the muses musick heer shall cheere o^r sprites
 the cates must be but meane wher scollers sitt. for thar (ma)de all wth courses of

[neate witt]

180

Moor. how now m^r morris

FOL. 13^b

moriss. I am a suter to yo^r Lordshipp in behalf of a servaunt of mine.

moore. the fellow wth Long haire good m^r moris

Com to me three years hence and then Ile heere yo^a

moris I vnderstand yo^r honor but the foolish knave has submitted him self to the
 mercy of a Barber. and is wthout redy to make a new vow befor your
 Lordshipp. heerafter to live Civell

moore. nay then letts talke wth him pray call him in

*Enter Faulkner. and
 officers*

190

Fauk. bless yo^r honor a new man my lord.

Moore. why sure this not he

Fauk. and yo^r Lordshipp will [yo^r L] the Barber shall give you a sample of

my head I am he Intaith my Lord, I am *ipse*,
Moore. why now thy face is like an honest mans

thou hast plaid well at this new cutt and wonn

Falk. no my lord Lost all that [god] ever god sent me

Moore god sent thee Into the world as thou art now wth a short haire. how quickly
 are three years ronñ out in Newgate

Falk. I think so my lord. for ther was but a hairens length betweene my going
 thether. and so long time

309

Moor Because I see som grace in thee goe free

Discharge him fellowes farewell m^r moris

[Enter a messenger] thy head is for thy shoulders now more fitt

[heere.] thou hast less haire vpon it but more witt exit

Moris. Did not I tell thee allwaies of thes Locks

Falk. And the locks were on againe all the goldsmiths in cheapside should not
 pick them open. shart. if my haire stand not an end when I looke for
 my face in a glass. I am a polecatt. heers. a lowsie Iest. but if I
 notch not that rogue tom barbar that makes me looke thus like a
 Brownist. hange me. Ile be worss to the nitticall knave. then ten
 tooth drawings [w] heers a head wth a pox [exit]

210

Morr: what ailst tho^a? art tho^a mad now.

Falk. mad now? nayles yf losse of hayre Cannot mad a man —
 what Can? I am deposde: my Crowne is taken from mee
 Moore had bin better a Scowrd More ditch, than a notcht
 mee thus, does hee begin sheepe sharing wth Iack Faulkner?

Morr: nay & yo^a feede this veyne S^r, fare yo^a well.

Falk: why fare well Frost. Ile goe hang my Selfe out for the —
 poll head, make a Sarcen of Iack?

Morr: tho^a desperate knave, for that I See the divell,
 wholly getty hold of thee.

220

Falk: the divelly a dambd rascall

Morr: I charge thee wayte on mee no more: no more,
 call mee thy m^r.

Falk: why then a word m^r Morris.

Morr. Ile heare no wordes, S^r, fare yo^a well.

Falk: Sbloud farewell:

Morr: why doest tho^a follow [yo^a] mee:

Falk: because Ime an Asse, doe yo^a sett yo^r shavets vpon mee, & then
 cast mee off? must I condole? haue the fates playd the foolles

230

weepes. am I theire Cutt? Now the poore Sconce is taken, must Iack
 march wth bag & baggage?

Morr: yo^a Coxcomb.

Falk: nay yo^a ha poacht mee, yo^a ha given mee a hayre, ity here
 here.

Morr: Away yo^a kynd [foole] Asse, come S^r, dry yo^r eyes,
 keepe yo^r old place & mend theis fooleryes.

Falk: I care not to bee tounrd off, and twere a ladder, so it bee in
 my humor, or the fates becon to mee; nay pray S^r, yf the destinyes
 Spin mee a fyne thred, *Falkner* flyes another pitch: & to
 avoyd the headach, hereafter before Ile bee a hayremonger Ile
 [bee a whoremonger. — *Exen*]

240

